THE New Republic

The Devil and De Sica

by Stanley Kauffmann

Page 21

Disengagement Reconsidered

By SIR JOHN SLESSOR

"Bureaucrats" and "Idealists"

Seventh in a Series on "The State of the Unions"

Modern Opera . . . . . *Frank J. Warnke*

The Anterooms of Faith . . . . . *Amos Wilder*

PATRICK O'DONOVAN REVIEWS

Allen Drury's "Advise and Consent"

SEPTEMBER 14, 1959

25 cents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Wire

The Mysterious 86th

THE MOST strongly Democratic Congress since Roosevelt times, having written the most Republican record since Coolidge times, is getting ready to go back home where it came from. It hopes to get out of Washington before Khrushchev gets in. There seems to be no very good reason why it shouldn't. It has done those things which President Eisenhower wanted it to do and it has left undone those things which he said it ought not do, and there is no help in it.

The House vote sustaining the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill was the last straw. If the Democratic majority couldn't win this one, it can't win any. This bill carried appropriations of $1.216 billion for waterway improvements of one kind and another—bridges, dams, harbor works and the like—for all sections of the country, which is to say for Congressional districts, the places in which Congressmen are elected. Yet Republican Congressmen flew back from California and other distant points to exercise the privilege of spurning this manna. With the help of a few Democrats, they made it appear that they had succeeded.

Their leaders told them not to worry about it—that the same projects would be provided for in plenty of time for the 1960 campaigns. And meanwhile they would get their economizer merit badges for passing the Administration frugality test.

True, President Eisenhower, in vetoing the bill, conceded that many of the projects were downright necessary and others desirable. He was disapproving the bill, he explained, because some of the projects were not included in his budget. (This is always the case with this bill.) However, the newspapers, as usual, were calling the measure "the pork barrel bill" and nobody could be hurt too much by voting to uphold the President's veto of it, particularly since the pork would be rendered in due course anyway.

What happened on the floor of the House when the roll was called on the question of sustaining or overriding the President's veto was enlightening. It showed how and why the Democratic majority has managed to lose so many of its fights with the Republican minority through the first session of the 86th Congress. Charles Halleck, the Republican leader, and his assistants were using everything but baseball bats to keep their votes in line. Every time the Democrats produced another vote, the Republicans produced a matching vote. When it was all over Halleck had one vote more than the one-third necessary to sustain the veto, and he had another standing by ready to switch if needed. The final count was 274 to 138.

Speaker Sam Rayburn and Democratic Leader John McCormack lost six Southern Democratic votes to Halleck. And they almost lost one of their senior associates in the leadership — Chairman Clarence Cannon of the Appropriations Committee, the man who was supposed to be responsible for the bill. Cannon voted with the Republicans on the initial roll call after telling John Taber, one of his Republican cronies, that he intended to do so. When it turned out that every single vote was needed, Rayburn and McCormack shamed him into "correcting" the record and voting with his party. He said he'd made a mistake the first time around. (The *Congressional Record* was edited to omit his change and his explanation for it.)

A Half-Hearted Congress

CANNON'S half-heartedness was not unique. There have been many cases of it throughout the session. Rayburn and Senate Democratic Leader Lyndon Johnson have been more than half convinced ever since the session started that the President's conservatism was about what the country wanted. What convinced them that the voters didn't mean what they seemed to say in the 1958 Congressional elections is a minor mystery. The nation's quick recovery from the recession certainly had something to do with it. Their own essential conservatism probably had even more to do with it. In any case, Johnson, after announcing a moderately liberal program before the session started, was me-tooing President Eisenhower in the name of "opposition responsibility" a few weeks later. Now Johnson quite obviously is running for President as the Democratic Eisenhower.

Maybe Johnson's reading of the signs of the times is right. Perhaps the voters who elected a Democratic and apparently liberal Congress less than a year ago are now satisfied with the policies of a President who becomes more openly the leader of a back-to-McKinley movement in domestic affairs the longer he remains in office. It is possible that they like the spectacle of Congressional subservience to this President. But there is no real evidence to prove it. Ike's high rating in the Gallup Poll almost certainly registers appreciation of his well-meant anti-intellectualism rather than of his policies. And nobody in his right mind has accepted the bias of the daily press as a reflection of voter opinion since the second Roosevelt inaugural.

No one will know for sure what the sovereign people think of this Congress and its performance until 1960. And then it will be too late for the Clarence Cannons to change their votes.

Kennedy Tried

SENATOR JOHN KENNEDY didn't succeed in delivering a labor reform bill that could be called the Kennedy bill, satisfy public demand for Jimmie Hoffa's hide and at the same time be acceptable to the AFL-CIO. It was probably too big an order for any man to fill. Yet it was what the Kennedy Presidential candidacy needed at this point. Failure though the effort was, Kennedy is being credited with an honest and intelligent try by AFL-CIO legislative experts. Certainly Kennedy's colleagues in the Senate and House won't let the law be called the Kennedy Act—at least not while it is generally thought to be a good thing. Nobody is so on his own as a Presidential candidate before he is sure of winning a nomination.

T.R.B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Republic

A JOURNAL OF OPINION

VOL. 141, NO. 11, ISSUE 2339
SEPTEMBER 14, 1959

THE WEEK 3

Mixed Feelings; Full-Time Job; Road Through Ladakh; "Free" Speech; Protest of the "Phoenix"; College Consumers' Union; The Big Floods

ARTICLES 7

Disengagement Reconsidered by Sir John Slessor

The State of the Unions—VII by Warner Bloomberg, Jr., Joel Seidman and Victor Hoffmann

BOOKS 16

MOVIES 21

MUSIC 22

GILBERT A. HARRISON, *Editor & Publisher*
HELEN FULLER, *Managing Editor*
SELIG S. HARRISON, *Associate Editor*
ROBERT EVETT, *Book & Music Editor*
F. R. RUSKIN, *Asst. to the Publisher*
Contributing Editors: Frank Getlein, B. H. Haggin, Irving Howe, Christopher Jencks, Gerald W. Johnson, Stanley Kauffmann, James E. King, Jr., Helen Hill Miller, Louis H. Pollak, Michael Straight

Published weekly (except for omissions of four summer issues) and distributed by The New Republic, 1244 - 19th St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Phone: REpublic 7-8656. Entered as second-class matter September 26, 1950, at the post office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Single copy 25¢. Yearly subscription, $8.00; Foreign, $9.00, Armed Forces personnel or students, $5.00. Subscribers desiring change of address should notify us at least three weeks in advance. Please include both old and new address.

Copyright © 1959, by Harrison-Blaine, Inc.

Correspondence

► *Hitchcockmanship*

SIRS:

IN the August 10 *NR*, Mr. Kauffmann wrote a review of Alfred Hitchcock which suggests some interesting points about both Mr. Hitchcock and film reviewing.

It is certainly true that Mr. Hitchcock

(Continued on page 24)

Mixed Feelings

WESTERN UNITY is revived. The President is his old affable energetic self. And if photographs are faithful to character, Mrs. Khrushchev will soon be moving among us wearing a plain cloth coat and a grandmotherly smile.

It is very exhilarating, like a clean sea breeze after days of fog and drift. Nevertheless, our feelings are as mixed as are those of most citizens—part astonishment, part hope, part apprehension.

We are as uninformed as the next man about what Mr. Eisenhower and President de Gaulle said to each other, or who influenced whom on what in Bonn, or where the restored Anglo-American camaraderie will lead us. But the events of the past several weeks, and no doubt the week to come, are at least remarkable. It is certainly astonishing to hear the West German Chancellor telling Mr. Khrushchev in a letter that it is "hard to say" how it came about that the hopes for friendly cooperation between Moscow and Bonn have "not been fulfilled to the degree I would have wished" and that *"it would be even harder to establish who is to be blamed."* It is likewise a bit surprising to have Mr. Khrushchev respond by saying that "we are ready for a reduction of armaments. We are ready to withdraw our troops from East Germany, Poland and Hungary if the Western countries will express the same readiness to withdraw their troops from foreign countries [and] if the Western partners [partners, mind you, not warmongering cliques] aren't ready to achieve all this at once, we can discuss a progressive program. We are ready to accept any effective control for the reduction of armaments and withdrawal of troops provided the Western countries will accept this and at the same time will liquidate their military bases."

In other words, to use a word which has become highly popular recently, the *atmosphere*—though not over Laos or the north frontier of India—is suddenly sweet.

Why then is there cause for apprehension?

Because, the USSR so far as one can tell is still dedicated to the proposition that war is inevitable. Not nuclear war, and not even necessarily war between states. But *class* war is still the stuff of history to Mr. Khrushchev, and the Soviet Union awaits and will abet the successful prosecution of that war throughout the world by the only political force it recognizes as worthy of ruling—namely Communist parties everywhere. If it does not have to, if the Russian national interest is not thereby served, the USSR certainly will wish to avoid the kind of massive Soviet military intervention that was required in Hungary to maintain the brutal authority of the only party considered "historically correct" by Moscow. But there are many kinds of intervention, just as there are many kinds of war. So that when Mr. Khrushchev and the President both extol peace, it is at least pertinent to examine what each means. Moreover, there is, as has been repeatedly pointed out in these pages, genuine reason for apprehension in the fact

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the military power of the West has been declining relative to the military power of the Soviet Union over the past several years. Neither "balancing the budget" nor any popular passion for spending money on more and more consumer comforts dictates Soviet decisions on how much is to be spent for what in the USSR. There, the security of the regime and the needs of the nation as interpreted by the party leadership come first—all else is secondary. It is characteristically realistic for Mr. Khrushchev within the same week to speak of the necessity for disarmament and to tell the graduates of Soviet armed forces academies that the Soviet army and navy are being reinforced at the present time in case of trouble.

Also, there is cause for apprehension in the noticeable decline in the American Congress of the will and intelligence to think and vote in terms of long-range, sustained, worldwide purposes. This has been particularly evident this year in the defection of substantial numbers of Congressmen, and not all of them from the South, from such trade-agreements or foreign-loan programs as are mandatory if co-existence is to be truly competitive, but which appear to the Congressmen to have no immediate economic appeal to their constituents. Little by little, but unmistakably, political leadership in this country has been selling out the future in its preoccupation with short political gains.

Finally, there may be currents in the thinking of the Soviet leadership which have not been plumbed deeply enough in the diplomatic negotiations that have gone on so long in Geneva, the UN and elsewhere, and if this is so, perhaps Mr. Eisenhower in his private talks with Mr. Khrushchev will get nearer to the bottom of things. But no one can say there has been a lack of communication between East and West during this past year—on the future status of free Berlin and the two Germanies, on detailed techniques for inspecting a nuclear test ban, cultural exchanges and formulae for reducing armaments so that the Soviet Union might have less reason to fear US overseas bases and the US might have less to fear from the vast conventional military power of Russia on the continent and its rapid development of ICBM's with nuclear warheads. Official attitudes on all these matters have been clarified to precision sharpness. Some modifications of well-established positions are undoubtedly possible and desirable on both sides. One can only await detailed information about what modifications may be proposed.

We are pleased that Mr. Khrushchev and his party are to be with us and that the President will see something of the Soviet Union. None will dispute Mr. Eisenhower that "peace is an imperative." But we have still to learn whether Mr. Khrushchev or Mr. Eisenhower has any further thoughts on how peace can be reconciled with fundamentally divergent views between the superpowers on how history is to be made.

Full-Time Job

HEAT, weariness and a profound doubt that it wishes to meet Comrade Khrushchev socially is providing the annual pre-adjournment rush in the Congress which sometimes approximates a panic. This is the time for the quick amendment, the parliamentary sleight-of-hand for which the smartest lobbyist always waits.

This is foolish says Senator Humphrey. Congress ought to "grow up." "My view," he declares, "is that Congress ought to grow up to its responsibilities and recognize that the times demand that it stay on the job throughout the year. We could provide at stated periods for members to go home without missing roll-call votes and we could give them an opportunity to live at least a few weeks of family life.

"This would avoid the annual rush for adjournment when a lot of bad legislation gets passed that wouldn't have a chance at any other time."

The American Congress was patterned after the British parliament which was, and still is, a part-time occupation. Both were supposed to be worthy occupations for gentlemen of other means. The big difference now is that American Congressmen are paid, and very well, for a full-time job, whether they work full-time or not, and their British counterparts are still paid as if they had other sources of income whether today they have it or not.

Since World War II with the need for frequent legislative action, Congress has been lengthening its sessions, often weeks beyond its usual July adjournment. Humphrey's suggestion may well appeal to many members who have learned that at home they are within easy reach of badgering constituents. To them a full year term with several well defined vacations during the year may well make sense, granting an appropriate number of extra vacation weeks in election years. Without question this would increase legislative responsibility.

Road Through Ladakh

THE NEWS of Chinese encroachments on Indian territory comes as a reminder that even in an age of nuclear politics the old geopolitical faultlines can still produce rumbles and tremors. The problem of the defense of India's border is one which Mr. Nehru inherited from the British *raj*. Chinese crossings of the Indian frontier follow years during which the Peking regime has asserted claims to Indian soil by official statements and by spurious maps. The only thing novel is that it is Mr. Nehru's angry voice which is being raised at a time when other world leaders speak in the subdued tones of experimental conciliation.

Some observers have linked recent Chinese penetration of India's North East Frontier Agency with Commu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nist moves in Laos. Whatever the motives of the invasion of Laos, the timing of the crossings into the NEFA may obtain from the same policy considerations. But the Chinese road-building program in Ladakh seems to have different motivations.

For one thing, the road-building project of the Chinese Communists across Indian territory began about a year and a half ago, well before the present storm. In such forbidding terrain as Ladakh, road construction is a time-consuming exertion not likely to be undertaken for temporary bargaining advantages. The shortest road between Gartok (Tibet) and Yarkand (Sinkiang) passes across Ladakh, which wedges into Chinese territory, separating southwest Sinkiang from eastern Tibet. Tibet this year came under firm Chinese control, as the traditional autonomy of Lhasa was drowned in blood; Sinkiang's ties with China have been less well defined.

Though officially part of China, Sinkiang has long been the object of Russian intrigue. Its population includes only a minority of Chinese among the four or five million inhabitants, most of whom have ethnic and religious-cultural ties with Turkic and Moslem peoples of Soviet Central Asia and of the Middle East. Apart from proximity, Russia can capitalize on the traditional relations between Sinkiang and other Turkic and Moslem areas. In recent years, the Soviet Union has increasingly posed as a friend of the Moslems, and has stressed the existence in its Central Asian republics of a Moslem population as a cultural and ethnic advertisement in the Middle East.

Over the last two years, there have been increasing reports of Chinese efforts to speed the development of Sinkiang's fertile Kashgar valley, and to implant Chinese settlers there. A road linking the Kashgar area with eastern Tibet would appear to be part of the same Chinese effort to build sounder, economic, demographic and strategic foundations for control of their Sinkiang and Tibet frontier areas. It comes at a time when the Russians, with marked success, have intensified their moves to gain fuller control over neighboring Afghanistan, whose Moslem, partially Turkic population appears to respond to Soviet overtures.

The road across Ladakh has understandably aroused the ire of Indians. But the Chinese may have other rivals in mind as they travel, partially over Indian soil, between Yarkand and Gartok.

"Free" Speech

ALMOST UNNOTICED by the general press, which of course has its mind on Bigger Things, the American public seems to have won a small but important victory, that of not being propagandized against its interests, at its own expense.

The Federal Power Commission, in other words, has ruled that private power companies may not propagandize against public power and then charge the cost up to the public as an operating expense. The campaign in question is that of the past several years in which through voluminous—and expensive— advertising in newspapers and magazines, the "independent light and power companies" inveighed unceasingly against public power. The question did not concern the truth or falsity of the advertising, but only whether it is proper and legal for the companies to charge its cost to their consumers and to the general taxpaying public as a management expense.

Since the campaign is solely for the benefit of company stockholders and, if anything, against the interests both of company customers and of the general public, it seems odd for the issue of free speech to arise. However, some beneficiaries of this type of advertising, and some organs of the newspaper trade, asserted that a ruling that the stockholders must pay for their own propaganda would in some way violate the right of free speech.

The Commission treated this nonsense as it deserves and declared there's no question of the right of free speech: "a requirement that such expenditures be paid by the stockholders rather than be charged to the ratepayer" does not violate the First Amendment.

Protest of the "Phoenix"

IN FEDERAL COURT in Hawaii on August 28 a United States citizen was convicted a second time for his dramatic method of testifying against the poisoning of the earth's atmosphere with radioactive fallout. Judge John R. Ross sentenced the defendant to two years imprisonment but suspended 18 months of the sentence and placed him on probation for five years.

The case was that of Dr. Earle L. Reynolds, a former Antioch College anthropology professor who was charged with violating an Atomic Energy Commission regulation barring all persons under US jurisdiction from entering a 390,000-square-mile segment of the Pacific unilaterally proclaimed a nuclear weapons testing area.

Reynolds, accompanied by his wife, his son and daughter and a Japanese friend, sailed the family yacht *Phoenix* into the forbidden zone on July 1, 1958. Their act was: (1) a deliberate moral protest against deadly pollution of the atmosphere of innocent peoples, and (2) a challenge to the legality of the AEC action in sealing off a portion of the open sea as large as Texas. Reynolds was rushed to trial and convicted in August, 1958. The new trial this year came as a result of an appellate court ruling that at the first trial Reynolds was improperly denied the right to conduct his own defense.

Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., who was belatedly allowed to act as defense counsel, filed with the Court of Appeals a morally compelling brief on the obligation of the US under international commitments to respect freedom of the seas and to refrain from contaminating other people's air without their consent. But the court based its reversal on one of Rauh's narrower legal arguments. The judge

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the second trial also ignored the international issues which were raised again by Rauh's associate, John Silard.

In the new appeal that is planned, the courts, whichever way they rule, are not likely to face up to broad moral questions. If they affirm the conviction, they can simply approve the narrow basis of Judge Ross' decision and, as he said, not concern themselves with the issues that "stand in the shadows" of the case. Or even if they find for the defendant, they could do so because of simple statutory or procedural defects in the AEC's position. This would permit correction of the defects by the AEC or Congress and leave the larger fallout controversy in the diplomatic forum where issues are measured not so much by the standards of justice as by the yardstick of Soviet conduct in the same field.

Whatever the legal outcome, the US seems destined to suffer a moral defeat in the eyes of much of the world. For Reynolds has succeeded in emphasizing that the US, to an unprecedented extent and contrary to its own basic traditions, has been infringing on the rights of others to life, liberty and property.

College Consumers' Union

NEARLY two million teenagers will enter their senior year in high school this month, and almost a million will be seriously thinking about going on to college. Yet of this million, only a relative handful will have competent guidance from those who know a lot about different colleges. Many more will get unreliable and often unfortunate directions from pseudo-experts—high school advisers who send even their most brilliant students to State U because they have never been any place else and parents for whom Princeton and Yale are it. The majority of students will not even have bad advice. They will merely listen to the grapevine, look through a couple of catalogues, and go where Uncle Jim went, where Classmate Ed goes, or where they have a good basketball team.

For many youngsters, the choice will prove miserable. A young athletic hero will pick Chicago because he hears that it is the richest university in the Midwest, and will find out later that his prowess invites only apathy or scorn on the Midway. A future country-clubber who expects college to promote his social contacts will discover that his choice of Bucknell dooms him to the isolation of the Susquehanna Valley for four years. And a mathematically-minded second generation Jewish immigrant will be attracted to Princeton by the recollection of Einstein, only to be dragged through the humiliation of Bicker. Partly as a result of such failures to match students with colleges nearly half the youngsters who go to college will leave without graduating. And many who stay will suffer unnecessarily—often without even knowing that they might have been both happier and better educated elsewhere.

The colleges themselves are largely responsible for these tragedies. They try to be all things to all people—attracting a "diverse" and "heterogeneous" student body which has all varieties of talent and will bring all kinds of credit to Alma Mater. Almost every college promises the same thing to its applicants: it will "broaden their minds," "teach them to think critically" and instruct them in all useful and interesting subjects; it will offer them "congenial friends" in a "relaxed but exciting atmosphere," and thus encourage "personal development" which will point the student toward social and occupational success.

The trouble is that most high school students cannot get the information they need. For $2.50 they can buy the new edition of *Lovejoy's College Guide*, which contains some bad advice from an old army man, and a list of 2,266 institutions which offer to teach anything from auto repair to Zen. Lovejoy tells the student where these institutions are, how big they are, how many books they own, what degrees they grant, whether they are accredited, how many fraternities they support, and so forth. But although such "facts" are useful to educational sociologists, they help the high school senior very little.

What the college applicant needs is consumer research on the product he is about to buy. He needs reliable and comprehensible reports on the socio-economic character of the student bodies at different colleges, on the patterns of work and play among students and alumni, on the relative strength of social, academic and athletic pressures of different campuses, and more subjective studies of the "personality" and "climate" of various colleges. Such research requires a reputable and wealthy sponsor, with courage to ignore the attacks which the academic world would surely launch on any such exposé of its propaganda. If the job is not undertaken by such a quasi-academic group, presumably a foundation, then it will eventually be done irresponsibly and incompetently as a *College Confidential*. Meanwhile, millions will miss their chance for the most suitable kind of education.

The Big Floods

YEARLY flood losses in this country are increasing and the danger of billion-dollar floods such as occurred in 1951 and 1955 is likewise increasing. That is the conclusion of a committee of University of Chicago geographers, headed by the noted Gilbert White, whose study of our national flood-control program was recently released. The geographers found that since adoption of a federal flood-control program in 1936, tangible losses have been more than $10 billion (in 1957 dollars), even while the Army Engineers were spending $4 billion to prevent flood damage and are in the process of spending $3 billion more on uncompleted projects. Between 1903 and 1936, flood losses averaged $105 million yearly; but since 1936 they have averaged $329 million a year, and the curve is upward. Moreover, these figures do not include the intangible losses—such as soil washed away—

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which the Department of Agriculture estimates would increase annual losses to more than $1 billion. Nor do they include relief expenditures such as the more than $100 million spent by the Red Cross since 1936, nor disaster allotments by federal, state and local governments.

The Army engineers are not to blame; they are like soldiers overcome through a breach in the rear, while valiantly defending a front. The engineers, the report notes, by necessity concentrate their defense against a "design" flood, one which may occur on the average at stated intervals and which represents a calculated risk. But there are more than 1,000 flood-endangered urban communities in the US, and one of the big floods—the breach in the rear for which defenses have not been prepared—hits the headlines every few years.

The chief blame for the rising curve of losses must be fixed on promoters' pressures which result in construction being built on the flood plains. The affected communities allow their eagerness for development and for new tax income to override the possible hazards. Boulder, Colorado, for example, which had a disastrous flood in 1894, has had none since, so that the 1894 plain is now covered by millions of dollars worth of structures which another such flood would overwhelm. Denver is protected against Cherry Creek floods, but not from serious overflow of its main intra-city stream, the Platte. Chattanooga, overconfident because of TVA protection that has stopped more than one potentially-ruinous flood, nonetheless is still fatally exposed to a really big one.

"No flood protection works in the US offer complete protection against all possible floods," the authors say. But the people think they do and build billions of dollars worth of homes and other structures on that faith. The logical solution would be zoning restrictions to keep people out of flood-plain areas, leaving to the rivers the realms they will overwhelm anyway in the event of a major flood.

Disengagement Reconsidered

by SIR JOHN SLESSOR

THE SUBJECT of what has come to be known—quite misleadingly—as "Disengagement" often crops up in discussion of Allied strategic policy. To some of us who have for some years been advocating something on these lines as a policy to be aimed at for the long-term solution of the deadlock in Europe, some popular versions of what "Disengagement" is supposed to involve appear rather astonishing. It may help to eliminate some confusion of thought if I, who first advocated what I prefer to call a policy of redeployment more than five years ago, try to define briefly what I mean by it.

Let me begin by stating what I do *not* mean by it. I do not mean that we should sign a solemn agreement with Mr. Khrushchev to withdraw all foreign troops from Germany at once, and then issue orders for the troops to march away and the airplanes to fly home, leaving an unarmed and neutralized Germany. I do not mean we should rely on Russian undertakings, however solemn and formal; or that our American allies should shake the dust of Europe off their feet and withdraw their armies, fleets and air forces to the other side of the Atlantic.

I do not suggest for a moment that the Kremlin would agree unless and until it became clear to them (as I believe in due course it might) that on balance they have, on a long view, more to gain than to lose by it.

I do not advocate the dissolution of NATO in the foreseeable future, or believe that this or the collapse of the growing political, economic and cultural cohesion of Europe would result from an eventual withdrawal of foreign troops from other peoples' countries on the Continental mainland. I do not suggest that this or any other modification of NATO's present military policy can be made irrespective of the political context, or in the international climate that is still an unhappy legacy of Stalin's brutal and treacherous duplicity. Surely the object of Mr. Macmillan's policy is to build up a political context in which a modification of military policy would become possible. And finally, I would be the last to advocate any military policy if I thought that it would diminish the real, as opposed to the theoretical, security of Western Europe.

The object of a policy of redeployment would be, in general terms, to contribute to the elimination of the present dangerous and unnatural division of Europe, and to the establishment of an international system under which the peoples of Europe, including the Russians, could ultimately co-exist peacefully as independent nations in increasing economic and cultural cooperation relieved of some of the burdens of armaments and with no foreign troops quartered on their soil. Surely it will not

MARSHAL OF THE ROYAL AIR FORCE SIR JOHN SLESSOR, *one of the principal directors of British air power during World War II and Chief of the Air Staff from 1950-1952, is the author of several books on strategy. His article first appeared in* The Observer *(London).*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be denied that if by some miracle we could create a situation in which, between the frontiers of France and Italy on the one hand and the USSR on the other, there was a broad belt of States, not aligned militarily with either East or West and with their own internal political systems—like Sweden or Yugoslavia—the whole European climate would be transformed to the immense advantage of all concerned.

THERE IS, of course, not the slightest chance of anything of the kind in the near future; but one of our troubles is that we tend to take too short a view of history; and we should not be deterred from adopting any policy by the belief—however well justified—that the Kremlin will oppose it. If that situation is what we should like to see, should we not now adopt it as the long-term aim of our policy and start taking the first tentative but practical and constructive steps toward making it ultimately impossible for the Kremlin to go on obstructing it? Should we not relentlessly press the Russians with proposals that they might be unable indefinitely to resist, aimed at achieving as soon as possible (and it will not be very soon) the first essential, which is the withdrawal of the Red Army behind the frontiers of Russia?

There is not the remotest prospect of the Red Army leaving East Germany as long as Allied troops remain in West Germany. There is, I think, equally little prospect of Russian troops withdrawing behind the Vistula as long as American and British troops remain on the Continent of Europe. Field-Marshal Montgomery is obviously as unimpressed as I am by the familiar argument that the Red Army could come back in a matter of days if not hours; "I would like to see it back in Russia, 1,000 miles away," he writes. "Why not let all national forces return to their own countries? . . . The forces of Federal Germany could well guard the NATO front in Central Europe—and who better?"

I have not gone, and would not go, as far as the Field-Marshal in suggesting that *all* national forces should withdraw to *their own countries*—I think a powerful American military presence on the eastern side of the Atlantic will be an essential for many years to come. And it obviously makes no sense to consider a military vacuum east of the Rhine. I have always maintained that someone has got to carry on the shield function of NATO—the powerful screen against major frontier "incidents," or minor aggression and the delaying role against all-out invasion. It is encouraging to find someone with Montgomery's experience endorsing the view that some others of us have held, that the German forces are (or could be made) perfectly capable of performing that function.

Past confusion of thought about this, the true role of SHAPE forces, is in some danger of becoming worse confounded by the impression, which seems to be gaining ground, that one indispensable element in the present NATO strategic concept—namely the thermonuclear capacity of the American Strategic Air Command—may not be brought into play except in the event of prior nuclear attack upon the continental United States.

Montgomery's reply to this is unduly oversimplified—"I thought we all belonged to an alliance, pledged to support any or all who are attacked or are in danger." Nevertheless, while it is absurd to imagine that the only possible response to, say, a blockade of Berlin or a staged Communist rising somewhere on the partition line supported by East German or Russian troops would be instant thermonuclear war, it surely would not be seriously argued that in the event of all-out war, with the Red Army thrusting to the Channel coast and Russian U-boats sinking ships in the Atlantic, any United States Government would take so short a view of their own interest as to tear up their solemn treaty obligations and do nothing, for fear of being attacked at home.

Even after withdrawal from mainland Europe it is devoutly to be hoped that the Sixth Fleet would still be in the Mediterranean, powerful air forces in the United Kingdom and North Africa and, one would hope also, a strategic reserve of United States as well as British airborne and tactical atomic units on the eastern side of the Atlantic, until all danger of aggression had disappeared.

But this is a doubt which *must* be resolved one way or another; we cannot have it both ways. Either we must stick to the existing NATO concept, the Shield in Europe with the Sword and Deterrent of thermonuclear Air; or we must resign ourselves to the necessity of defending Europe by purely local action. To me the latter frankly makes political, economic and military nonsense. Are we to eliminate the deterrent by throwing away our nuclear capacity? We should need not fewer bombers but probably more, if they are denied the ultimate weapon, to support the conventional forces in Europe. Instead of the planned thirty and actual twenty divisions in SHAPE we should need about sixty, or their equivalent in fighting value, and correspondingly powerful air forces. With respect to Mr. Acheson and others, who point out that in the Western Alliance we have more men, materials and money than the Soviet bloc, that (though true) is in practical terms irrelevant. The theory of a so-called conventional deterrent and a strategic concept confined to the local defense of the NATO frontier in Europe just does not make any sense.

It is clear that nothing that openly implies a policy of redeployment will be agreed upon between the Allies for a Summit meeting this year. It looks as though the most one can hope for in the near future is some acceptable temporary arrangement for Berlin, and the beginnings of some political *détente* in the form of a limited *de facto modus vivendi* between the two Germanys—which in effect already exists. But when some of the fog engendered by emotion, mutual suspicion among the NATO Allies, muddled thinking and previous rigid and unima-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ginative attitudes has blown away, I would hope to see the Western Powers go to a Summit meeting with something on the following lines upon the agenda as a long-term plan:

► The aim to be the withdrawal of all foreign forces from the countries of Continental Europe—the Russians behind their existing frontiers and the British and Americans from Continental soil; the frontier of Germany to be the Oder-Neisse line.

This to be accomplished as soon as possible, subject to the necessary safeguards, including as a *sine qua non* effective control and inspection; but it should be recognized that it may take as long as ten years, or even more, to bring to complete fruition.

► Mutual withdrawal should be by stages, initially very limited, and all under effective control and inspection. Each stage would be tested to ensure it is being honestly worked, before passing on to the next stage. If at any stage we found the Russians were double-crossing us, the whole process would be stopped and put into reverse.

► Allied troops will remain in Berlin until it is mutually agreed that the situation has reached a stage when they can safely be withdrawn. This is not expected to be an early stage. Meanwhile (unless already agreed in 1959) the Allies would welcome a United Nations "presence" in Berlin and United Nations control over at least the Allied military traffic on the Helmstedt autobahn.

► The first stage would be the establishment of control and inspection arrangements, including an "open skies" aerial inspection system in a limited zone.

► In this stage it would be necessary to establish reciprocal systems of early warning radar screens and mobile control teams against surprise attack, Russians west of the Rhine and Allies in the satellites. I think this a more useful and practical alternative in the long term to the small token forces which I previously visualized, or the larger token forces of two American divisions and one British division that Montgomery suggests. In that respect they would serve the same purpose—men in British and American uniforms "in the front line" as a tangible pledge to our European allies of our commitment.

► An essential condition must be that German rearmament should proceed at least to the agreed Paris levels. I would like to see in addition a semi-static screen in depth of localized but well-trained "Home Guard" troops, armed only with light and anti-tank weapons, for anti-tank defense, control of demolitions, and internal security against armed Communist infiltration or rebellion in forward areas.

► Stage II might be a withdrawal of *other than German* troops from a limited zone either side of the partition line—something like the "strip zero" of M. Mendès-France, perhaps 50 miles wide. Next might be the withdrawal, again of other than German troops, from the whole Soviet zone of Germany and from an area of corresponding width west of the partition line.

It is not worth now trying to visualize further stages either in scale or in tempo. They would depend on how the first stages work, but the process might gather impetus if it were found by inspection that both sides were working the scheme faithfully. In the earlier stages it would surely be an advantage if some form of United Nations force could police the partition line.

► The Allies should give an undertaking, registered with the United Nations, that after German reunification the present Soviet zone will be demilitarized—no forces stationed there and fortifications, airfields, etc., demolished.

► My proposal in 1954 visualized Germany coming into and remaining in NATO. It seems not impossible that Russia would prefer Germany to remain in NATO as limiting her freedom of action and potential for future aggression. But I have since come to think that, if a redeployment policy is to have any chance of Russian acceptance (and incidentally if German reunification is ever to become a reality), it would almost inevitably have to involve in its very last stage the withdrawal of Germany from NATO—and, of course, of the satellites from the Warsaw Pact. I think that would be acceptable on military grounds. I do not believe Germany can ever again be a military menace to her neighbors; thinking Germans know very well that the only certain result of another great war would be that Germany would finish up as a radioactive charnel house. And I see no reason to assume, as some do, that a militarily non-aligned Germany would mean the collapse of European cultural and economic cohesion. There might be some difficulties about the Common Market after a reunification of Germany. But if Sweden and Switzerland, Eire and Austria can belong to things like OEEC and the Council of Europe, why not Germany? Indeed, the logical ultimate outcome might be that these institutions would be strengthened by the addition of some nations of Eastern Europe, though that perhaps is looking rather far ahead.

► In any event, but more especially in the event of Germany understandably seeking some guarantee for her security in place of membership of NATO, there will have to be some Mutual Guarantee of European Security on the lines of the Brussels Treaty of 1948, under which "If any of the parties should be the subject of armed attack in Europe" (no matter by whom) the others automatically come to the aid of the party attacked. In this the initiative should be taken by NATO; and the obligations and advantages of participation should be offered to Russia and her satellites as soon as the Red Army is back behind its own frontier.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STATE OF THE UNIONS—VII

"Bureaucrats" and "Idealists"

by WARNER BLOOMBERG, JR., JOEL SEIDMAN AND VICTOR HOFFMANN

"PORKCHOPPER" used to be something of an epithet often rather affectionately applied to a unionist who had "risen" to the level of a paid staff man. He might be an organizer, an "expert" on grievances, or perhaps a member of the public relations or political action department if the union had one. A small number of intellectuals who for personal and ideological reasons attached themselves to labor organizations, mainly during the 1930's, were about as close as most unions came to having professional bureaucrats. In recent years the staffs of all but the poorest or most stable unions have grown substantially. There are specialists (who are often university graduates but have rarely been "workers") in such "professional" capacities as research, education, publications, public relations and legal affairs.

One staff man illustrates this by what he calls "the urinal theory of union bureaucracy." When he was in the national office of a then small, poor union, they occupied one floor of a building and had one toilet. Here sometime during each week the various staff personnel and the elected officers almost inevitably encountered one another and exchanged views. As the union prospered it acquired a new building and used several floors for offices. The president had his own toilet and pretty soon each department had its own toilet. Staff specialists met only their own kind in this highly informal situation, and viewpoints were exchanged between departments only by memo or at formal meetings. And therefore it became harder and harder for anyone to find out what was going on throughout the national headquarters!

Generally speaking, staff personnel in the CIO and in the progressive AFL unions are respected by top officers and often have had some autonomy in developing their programs in research, education, community affairs and the like. Many of the AFL leaders, used to smaller cadres of "bureaucrats" with a good deal less prestige within the organizations, were especially hostile just after the merger to CIO staff personnel. The latter were stunned to find themselves initially excluded from all important meetings of the Executive Council, for they were used to sitting in, or at least "listening in," on policy conferences.

Although the relationship between staff personnel and elected officials varies greatly as one moves from one union of the AFL to another, within the merged Federation the tendency is clearly more in the direction of the old CIO pattern. Some former CIO staff people still feel that they are treated too much like "hired hands," too little as highly valued contributors. And those who feel this most strongly are men and women who see their work not only in terms of rendering a skilled service to the organization, but also of having some broader impact on the direction of the labor movement.

"Our job," comments a staff man in a middle-sized union's education and research department, "is to supply the irritant and the ferment in the organization." He is fairly young, bright, competent, college educated. His job requires long hours, does not pay especially well, and has a high ulcer potential. Yet he cannot let go of it: not because it permits him easily to convert ideals into action, but because he sees even less chance to change society through its other major institutions. And he wants to change it!

The position of an idealist is often a touchy one, for "ferment" must be created through, or at least with the aid of, the "men of power," the elected officialdom. And they are as varied in character as the unions themselves, perhaps more so. Some of them retain a compassionate concern for humanity, but their positions require them much of the time to serve narrow organizational interest, pushing on along increasingly routine lines for the "more" expected by the members. If they occasionally make remarks reflecting broader interests, it may sound to outsiders, or even to many unionists, like campaign oratory. Many others have no desire to be anything but straightforward representatives of organized interest groups. A few are opportunists who see

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the "union business" as a "good racket," and occasionally there is a racketeer.

To influence policy the staff man must affect those officers who make it. He may sometimes try to bypass them, to shake the thinking and thereby the actions of middle echelon officials or even local leaders. But this requires at least the tacit consent of the top men who hire and fire. The staff man who earns the antagonism of the "boss," like a relatively unprotected employee anywhere, may soon be checking the want-ads.

Perhaps the most powerful staff man in many unions is the lawyer, for the officers increasingly depend upon him for guidance as union affairs become more and more entangled with the courts and with state and national agencies administering laws that impinge upon the union's work. Contract proposals must be scrutinized for legal traps and tricks. In critical bargaining sessions when even trusted and admired directors of research may be excluded, the lawyer is likely to be present. He also provides essential guidance in the union's lobbying for or against legislation. However, not all union lawyers are as much legal philosophers or as much concerned with the shape and substance of unionism as Arthur Goldberg, Industrial Union Department counsel. Many of them make little effort to affect the purposes and character of the movement, preferring the more limited role of technicians. And lawyers have perhaps the least contact with the rank and file of any staff people—indeed, many of them are not properly staff personnel since they are on retainers rather than actually within the organization.

The Word Artists

IN CONTRAST to the lawyers, newspapers and public relations personnel are generally among the weakest segments of the power structure. The union newspaper or magazine is a house organ which is expected to serve not just the interests of the organization, but also the interests of the incumbent administration. Since union officers often do not differentiate between the two, they may see their newspaper editors, who frequently double in brass as public relations men, as their personal representatives. They are rarely allowed to inject policy controversy into their publications (the *Wisconsin CIO News,* a merger victim, was something of an exception), and they are not in much of a position to create it within the ranks of union policy-makers. (There are some important exceptions to this pattern—for example, Brendan Secton, UAW education director, who also edits their slick magazine *Ammunition,* is part of the inner cadre of top leadership built up around the Reuther brothers.)

On the other hand, those who carry on the work of "education" and "research"—and the same individuals often have both functions—in many ways are becoming important. They—like the lawyers—provide a kind of expertise on which elected officers more and more depend. Through education programs they reach the lower levels of leadership and in small ways even the active rank and file. Also they are often the bridge between unions and liberal intellectuals in universities and foundations. While lawyers may guide leaders safely through the maze of legal booby traps, it is the research staff which prepares the testimony and helps write the speeches. Putting words into a man's mouth occasionally provides an opportunity for putting ideas into his head.

Sometimes the process is less direct but possibly more effective. A research man for a major union describes how an extremely detailed study which his department initiated of the differentials among the contracts obtained for workers in different types of plants and industries led to a major reappraisal of policy by the top leadership. Quite unintentionally they had been neglecting smaller plants and certain industries which were not so central to the union's main area of jurisdiction.

The research function is also important for bargaining, where the union must be prepared to meet company challenges on fact and interpretation, including fact and interpretation touching on matters which the managers consider their critical secrets—such as unit production costs. Here, again, the researchers may at times have some influence on the thinking of the union executives, for while they "only carry out policy," the facts they supply focus attention on needs and limitations that the union leadership must face up to. "Call it

---

This is the seventh of a series of articles examining the American labor movement since the merger.

MR. BLOOMBERG, once an hourly-paid employee in a half-dozen different factories, is now Assistant Professor of Sociology at Syracuse University and a contributor to *Harper's, The Reporter* and *Commentary.*

MR. HOFFMANN, once an agricultural laborer and canning factory employee, is now Associate Professor of Government at Valparaiso University in Indiana and contributes articles to *The Lutheran Quarterly* and *The Cresset.*

MR. SEIDMAN, who has been an organizer and labor education worker, is now Professor of Industrial Relations in the School of Business at the University of Chicago and has written many studies of union leadership and union democracy including *Union Rights and Union Duties.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the 'realism functions'," suggests a research man in a large industrial union.

But it also must be recognized that the possibilities for a research and education staff to affect policy remain largely peripheral and occasional, and even these may disappear when the officers are unreceptive. In the final horse-trading of contract negotiations, union and management representatives play off against one another their skills and bargaining power. These, not their respective research materials, determine the outcome. Education directors may be assigned the task of selling the official position of the administration to the active members, but are not expected to provide a forum for opposition viewpoints. Sometimes they may simply serve as window dressing.

(SEIDMAN: Too often the staff man over the years becomes cynical. When the union paper serves merely as a house organ, or when the education department is assigned the job of "selling" the members on policy rather than permitting free discussion of issues, the professional personnel may protect their own self-respect by a kind of "realism" which asserts, in effect, that this is the way things go and that little can be done about it. The shift from idealism to cynicism is not ordinarily sudden; it is a process of attrition. Unions thus have allowed the frictions of internal power politics and of organizational pressures seriously to erode one source of democratic spirit and drive. But this is an aspect of the larger problem of the state of freedom within the union structure.)

(HOFFMANN: Not so long ago many of us were hoping that labor unions would "grow up," would become a respectable and respected part of American society. The development of union bureaucracy is a reflection of that growing maturity, but it has brought some by-products that are deadly to the heart and soul of humanism—unions have come to share in the American "organizational man" pattern. Now it is easier to work night and day on institutional matters, on issues and policies that serve mainly to protect the organization, while on the other side of the hill a lot of humans are looking for help. I go on hoping that unions will get around to taking more seriously their stated broad objectives for ameliorating human social ills. On occasion one dreams that the American churches will take that goal more seriously. If they don't, and the labor movement doesn't, then who will?)

(BLOOMBERG: The sense of dedication to reform often seems to diminish in unions as you go from the top officials through the local leadership into the rank and file. Perhaps this is because the leadership tends to be more educated than the rank and file, to be much more exposed to contacts with the larger society, and often to be more concerned with having a rationale for the existence of unions. Yet most of the elected officials display little that could be considered a developed philosophy of unionism, such as staff personnel frequently verbalize with facility. To the extent that a short-run outlook coupled with materialistic expediency is common in our country, it is not surprising to find it among those who "wheel and deal" in unions. What surprised me was the number of union officials in the upper echelons who were dedicated and somewhat philosophical, and the larger number of staff people who seemed to me still to be pushing for a more democratic and socially conscious unionism.)

But there are not many research men in unions today who are simply neutral technicians who "happen" to be working for labor instead of management. Most of them are there because they believe in what unions are doing, or could do. Increasingly men with university degrees, they have come into unionism by way of belief and staff openings rather than through shop work or picket lines. Understandably, therefore, most of them feel less content with unions as they are than do the leaders who have risen from the ranks.

The Auto Workers' doctrine that union intellectuals ought to have several years experience in the shops, if they haven't actually "risen out of the ranks," strikes many as a constraining dogma of a provincial sort. An elected officer in another international suggests that it is "something like saying only women who have had babies should be allowed to be teachers." Since Jimmie Hoffa "rose" from the ranks while the able and honest Ralph Helstein, president of the Packinghouse Workers, is a lawyer by training and background, it is perhaps wise to be cautious about the "magic" of shop experience.

The School of Hard Knocks

STAFF MEN with whom we spoke frequently expressed their admiration for some of their most important "students," the elected officials, who are fond of announcing (with a mixture of pride and defensiveness) that they have "only degrees from the school of hard knocks!" Said one researcher, "Our international officers have learned much by necessity. When you think that they must grasp the intricacies of pensions, insurance, unemployment compensation, and the like, at least in general terms, and must know how they work out in practice, you have some idea of their 'assignments'."

"I'm singularly unimpressed with many top industry spokesmen I've heard," he added, "expounding the Adam Smith economics they learned back when they went to college. I really doubt if many of the top industrial executives read as much or think as much about a broad range of social issues as many of our top union officers do. In a straight-forward debate, where thinking and information counted, I suspect that our international presidents would show up quite well against their industrial counterparts, except for cleverness and polish. You encounter greater competency on the levels of management below the top, and that is where we begin to get weaker."

Knowledgeability, however, does not necessarily mean

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

idealism. Few top union officers are very "idealistic" when it comes to collective bargaining. For example, does organized labor have any particular responsibility when it comes to such matters as inflation? Most union leaders say no. Publicly they point to high corporate profits, industrial expansion paid for by accumulated liquid assets rather than outside risk capital, substantial corporate dividends even during the recession. Privately, many of them confess to seeing no other way to continue to push toward a re-distribution of income in the United States, toward the continued upgrading of wage workers —if necessary at the expense of the highest strata—than to keep up the pressure for wage increases.

Union leaders also point out that some of those suffering most from long-term inflation are in occupations which "refuse" to organize. A Steelworker district staff man's remarks are blunt, but typical: "We want to bring them into the same economic fold as our people. But until they get off their fannies and organize to fight for their economic rights, they are going to take a little of the brunt of our economic expansion." And how do you organize the old, the migrant, the casual worker, the sick? His answer is equally direct: "We have done more than any other group to get legislation to help the people at the bottom. The people at the bottom can only be helped by society as a whole. Just who has pushed for the extension of social security, for government aid to health, for public housing? The big corporations? The Chamber of Commerce? The AMA?"

An AFL-CIO regional director, who had become an organizer for the AFL in the middle 1930's and whose ties with ordinary union members are still close, echoes this "practical" tone: "Sure, I'm in favor of raising wages wherever possible. It's good to have more things. The laboring man always wants to improve himself. Who doesn't? Maybe some of these big guys should stop buying two or three cars? Isn't this inflation, too? That's the way I feel. That's about all I know. How am I to know about the relation of prices to wages and to profits and such matters? You better see an economist about these things." "If it looks like there may be a strike," says a Steelworker local officer, "then you hear a lot of talk in the shops about inflation, and is it worth it all? But if you can get an increase in wages and benefits without any strike, the boys lose a little of their social conscience!"

Outside the UAW, you don't hear much but derogatory noises about Reuther's recurring demands that the companies open their books on costs and accept price stability in the face of wage increases as a matter for bargaining—a suggestion guaranteed to raise the blood pressure of corporate management. They feel that Auto Worker officers know quite well that the demand will not be granted, that it is nothing more than public relations. But if major industries and unions, with their tremendous impact on the economy, ever do decide that contracts must be read to some degree in the light of their general consequences for the nation, it will probably happen first in Auto.

Robert Olson, president of the Minnesota AFL-CIO, formerly state AFL president, summarizes the union leader's tactical situation quite neatly: "We have to be, first of all, labor men and keep getting wages, benefits, and so on for our people. For them, this is the best proof of a good job of leadership. I guess we really don't think too much about things like inflation. We're usually trying to catch up to something somebody else has inflated!" Highly political (in some ways he's Minnesota labor's primary lobbyist), feeling that labor in Minnesota has a strong trend of idealism and liberalism, Olson nevertheless does not see why moral burdens should be placed solely, or even primarily, upon the working man and his organizations. "If other guys in business and the like are asking for profits and raises, why not us? If they move into the political arena like the Chamber of Commerce has, why not us? If they'll cut profits, we'll cut wages. We will keep the rank and file on the cost of living index. We have to keep our end up. If they want to stop inflation, we'll have to do it together."

Similarly, Steelworker international officer Abel doesn't see why the powerful unions in high-wage industries should cut back on their demands, should, in effect, lower the sights of the whole society, because they sympathize with the unorganized workers ("a drag on our progress, frankly") or with those in weaker unions or in unions in declining industries. In many ways these union officials sound like the stereotype of the 19th Century capitalistic entrepreneur — competitive, aggressive, in some ways rather earthy, not overly sympathetic with those who "fall by the wayside" outside of the organization.

Weakness in the Middle

A COMPLAINT we heard very often in industrial unions is that local leaders and the rank-and-file members lack knowledge and discipline when it comes to upholding contractual rights. (The building trades, relying upon personal negotiations conducted on behalf of local members by the business agent, have quite a different situation.) Many workers will hesitate to file grievances, partly for fear of antagonizing their foremen in particular and managers in general, partly because they are so unsure of their rights. Others cause trouble because they do not know their obligations. What the unions with the most extensive education programs are trying to do is to establish within each plant a cadre of adequately sophisticated local officers and rank-and-file actives to insure a more adequate translation of formal contracts into daily working conditions and routines.

It is this weakness of middle echelon and local leadership that union education departments constantly struggle to repair. As a result, much of union education is "vocational," dealing with contract administration, grievance

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

procedures, parliamentary conduct of meetings, and with the special functions of certain offices and committees—union finances, pensions, medical insurance and so on. "We start with the bread-and-butter issues," said John Powderly of the Steelworkers education department, "but we don't stop there."

Under Education Director Emery Bacon, the Steelworkers have been experimenting for several years with a "four-year" program involving a week of intensive work in residence at a university each year for four years. The week during the first year is devoted to the relationship between the union, the worker and his job. Those who return for "the second year" take up "the Steelworker and the community." The "third year" deals with the "challenge of leadership" and focuses upon the psychology and techniques of communication. At one time the fourth year dealt with world affairs, but a few years ago in cooperation with Penn State a switch was begun to "the world of ideas," following the lead of specialists in adult education. "Fourth year" students, usually local union leaders, have spent a week reading poetry, short stories and novels—and asking what the artist and the humanist is trying to say about the human condition with which they so pragmatically deal in the factories where they work and in the towns and cities where they live. The experiment so far seems to have met with real success.

No one pretends that this "liberal education" on a one-week-a-year basis is revolutionizing the rank and file. As Powderly put it, the aim is to "create an 'itch'." Further reading is recommended for those who want to "scratch," especially pocket books. But there is no follow-up and no home-study program of any sort.

While the effects of union education efforts obviously should not be over-estimated, neither should they be dismissed. Compared with bargaining, politicking and striking, the activity is piecemeal and little publicized. But it goes on and on, with all its variety in content and quality. For the worker (often but by no means always a union officer) who can get his local's backing for participation (often but by no means always a requirement), it can provide contact with a far wider world than he encounters in his daily round—the world of civil rights, of foreign affairs, of city planning, of the arts.

While some of the oldest unions in the nation have little or no such educational programs—the building trades, for example, or the railroad brotherhoods—the evidence is substantial that the merger will spread rather than diminish this activity. The Trainmen a few years ago voted in the first modern educational program among the railroad operating crafts, and it is apparent that closer contact with "progressive" unions creates some pressures on the leaderships of those organizations which have "gotten along without."

Beyond the Job

THE EFFORTS of education departments may seem sometimes to be little more than ritual busy-work, like putting up posters and setting out piles of "issues" literature at a convention or conference, but sometimes an inspired idea meets with real response and produces an activity such as the conference on the peacetime uses of atomic energy held by organized labor in Cleveland, Ohio. The first local community conference of this sort, it received world-wide recognition. The program involved about 500 delegates and participants, including representatives from the AEC, from the UN, from India, Israel, Italy, England and several other countries. It is difficult to say just what kind of effect the conference had on the populace of this one metropolitan center, but it obviously meant a lot to many active union members to have been its proud sponsors. And it reaffirmed the avowed concern of many trades unions for matters that lie far beyond wages, hours and job security.

Dozens of community-level conferences covering a wide range of issues are held by organized labor each year, many of them smaller in scope though not necessarily lower in quality than the Cleveland performance. In almost every case, key ideas and the core organizing efforts came from either staff men or officers with whom they had worked successfully over the years.

Not many years ago most academicians who were involved in any way with "labor education" were industrial relations or union education specialists, usually at state universities or land grant colleges. More recently some of the larger unions have been working with their original contacts at larger universities to bring in more teachers—political scientists, sociologists, economists.

The Auto Workers have one of the most extensive educational programs in organized labor, but they also make the least possible use of the professors. Partly this reflects their concern for the building up of an independent labor intelligentsia, their belief that many university people, even the self-proclaimed "liberals,"

REPRINTS AVAILABLE
Complete 21-page series on
"India, Pakistan and the US"
by SELIG S. HARRISON
Single copy 50c 3 copies $1
10 copies $2.50
•
THE NEW REPUBLIC
1244 - 19th Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are seriously biased by a middle-class outlook and by the sometimes unconscious constraints of their accommodations to business-dominated institutions of higher learning. With respect to subjects such as economics, bargaining or time study, they feel that most university faculty do not know the union point of view adequately and tend to teach one much more compatible to management's outlook. The academicians also may have difficulty "reaching" the rank-and-file member, who is more in evidence at Auto Worker institutes than at those of many other unions.

The other side of the coin is argued by educational staff people in many other unions—that, as one of them put it, an important contribution to the union member's experience comes from "the university's ability for free discussion. The professor is somewhat exempt from the organizational pressures and imperatives. He may be able to develop kinds of controversy that union personnel would avoid."

As a matter of fact the Auto Workers do use university faculty in areas which their staff can service only with difficulty, and they use the physical plant of the university for many of their conferences and institutes in various parts of the country. Costs present one serious difficulty. From the union point of view most universities charge a very substantial fee for the services of their facilities, and professors whose sympathy for the labor movement extends to doing institutes or classes for low pay or "for free" are not very numerous. Bill Abbott of the Rubber Workers education department points out that "the small locals use up a large part of their funds on bargaining, negotiating and grievances. This is especially true in some of the smaller plants where you have an 'unreconstructed' management that forces a lot of arbitrations."

The Broader View

UNION EDUCATION staff people criticize their own efforts for many reasons. At a conference they held at the University of Illinois not so long ago several complained that too many of the fellows going to institutes and conferences from local unions went just for the trip—that they aren't really interested, and enjoy the recreation and the sociability without learning anything from the classrooms. Given the problem of costs, this can be a close to heartbreaking admission for the education director of a labor organization. However, a majority who were there seemed to agree with one who claimed that "there are other results of these conferences. They bring broadening contacts to local officers who otherwise wouldn't ever see farther than their own plants and towns. Union leaders from different parts of the country, from different ethnic groups, and so on, get together and live together, and learning about each other is an education in itself." Yet he added, wistfully, "Of course it would be nice if they'd pick up stuff from the classroom, too."

It was probably inevitable that union leaders at the top should come to think and act somewhat like industrial managers, which is in part what they are. It is hardly surprising to discover that the many rather idealistic people on union staffs often fail to influence the attitudes of the "bosses" very much, or that their programs and publications often must serve the administration's political interests. But it is far too early in the historic development of modern unionism in America to make any final assessment of the influence on the "bureaucrats" and the members of the idealistic departments of education and research. The social revolution which surged through the industrial towns and cities during the thirties has become "institutionalized," and the unions have come to have stable executives served by a growing corps of professional staff personnel. It remains to be seen how much capacity for "movement" has been built into this union bureaucracy.

(SEIDMAN: The number of professionals and technicians on the staffs of national unions is bound to grow as union business becomes more complicated. Unions must attract men and women whose skills make possible alternative types of employment—in industry, in government, in education. If highly qualified personnel are to be recruited and kept by unions, they must be provided with adequate salary, influence, and independence.)

(BLOOMBERG: Influence and independence might help compensate for less salary than could be obtained elsewhere. Ironically, while unions will increasingly be trying to organize other technical and professional personnel, offering them such non-wage benefits as more freedom from bureaucratic restrictions, more chances for interesting research, greater job security, and more opportunities for additional training, it does not seem to occur to most union executives to offer the same benefits to their own staffs. Setting an example by better treatment of staff personnel within unions might enhance the chances of unionizing "bureaucrats" elsewhere.)

(HOFFMANN: Those of us who teach college people know how seldom the bright young men and women who can become lawyers, doctors, directors of public relations, and the like, are persuaded to take a position with the labor movement. And unionists sometimes seem afraid of bright, dedicated young people, seem to ask: If they upset the applecart at school or elsewhere, won't they do it in the labor movement, too? But I also have some fears of the professionals, the experts, when they look upon themselves mainly as people with skills to sell. They sometimes become too proud of their skills seen as scarce commodities that can be sold to the highest bidder. They may become more dedicated to their skills and the marketing of them than to the labor movement or to the solution of human problems. I look upon this as a crucial point, not only for the labor movement, but for American life in general.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS & COMMENT

Anterooms of Faith?

by Amos N. Wilder

LITERARY discussion in America has been relatively free of the kind of religious axe-grinding and polemic, proselytizing and unchurching which has disgraced though enlivened the French literary scene. It is true that critical disparagement of the later writing of Eliot and Auden was sometimes motivated by irrelevant considerations related to their return to the church. But apart from them, we had no major talents that could be identified with a dogmatic position either Catholic or evangelical. How different the situation in Europe has been becomes clear when we recall the names of Bloy and Péguy, Bernanos and Mauriac, Claudel and Max Jacob, Chesterton and Belloc, Graham Greene and Charles Williams. Conversely we find abroad that non-confessional writers like Gide or Gottfried Benn or Cocteau rather inevitably are thrown into the role of heretic or blasphemer.

The Prophetic Voice in Modern Fiction
by William R. Mueller
(Haddam House; $3.50)

Within the last few years a new attention has been given to the religious or theological aspects of American literature, and indeed by theologians themselves, and fortunately for the most part without an inappropriate dogmatic intention. The very character of the best contemporary novel or play elicits such scrutiny. Certainly when novelists like Camus, Faulkner and Robert Penn Warren fall into the hands of theologians and undergo moral and religious assessment they have only themselves to blame. They invite such attention by their material and thrust. They may even find a more informed tribunal among theologians than among some professional critics, for churchmen alert to the contemporary arts and theologian-critics are growing in numbers and in sophistication. Every good divinity school today has courses in the significant fiction, poetry and drama of our time. At one time it may have been looked on as a necessary form of slumming in the education of the would-be prophet. Today it seems more than likely that the real prophets are among the writers in question.

With theologian-critics in England like George Every and Martin Jarrett-Kerr, and here at home like Stanley Hopper (Drew), Nathan Scott (Chicago), Roy Battenhouse (Indiana) and Hillis Miller (Johns Hopkins), men trained both in letters and theology, the Protestant churches are by way of redeeming themselves somewhat for their disqualification in modern literature. Others like Paul Tillich have redressed the balance in other arts. In New York, the American churches have now a clearing house for engagement with all the contemporary arts, with the active support of recognized musicians, architects, critics, etc., so that something is really being attempted with respect to Sunday School art, jingly hymn books and church architecture, whether the Akron-ark, the false Gothic or the barrack-baroque.

In the field of letters the confraternity of teachers of English have naturally looked somewhat quizzically upon the new entrants into their lists. F. R. Leavis fulminated some years ago against the idea of a "Christian discrimination." The theologian-critic like the Marxist-critic can err in either of two ways: he can be chargeable in Leavis' phrase of "pushing his own line of goods," in this case religious propaganda; or he can just be a bad and unqualified critic. With a view to removing all suspicion of narrow-mindedness and dogmatism he may also make the mistake of hailing with superlatives any and every example of the most advanced writing, particularly the most sensational and scandalous.

But the literary have shown by and large a generous attitude to the theologian-critics, giving them a place in their annual meetings or in university lecture series and consenting to lecture under theological auspices. They are no doubt intrigued to see some new recruits to this or that form of the new criticism from an unlikely quarter. Or they are secretly curious to know what the religious ideas may be of a churchman who professes to be interested in Hart Crane or William Carlos Williams. When I gave a lecture in this area once at Kenyon College Mr. Ransom was kind enough to express his gratification in the course of the discussion that a theologian could locate figures like Nietzsche and D. H. Lawrence among the "outriders" of the Christian pilgrimage. I believe also that Robert Penn Warren was a little surprised to find one of the earliest printed appreciations of his *Brother to Dragons* coming from a theologian, and a cherished note to myself reflects this.

It is true that we have with us philosophers and critics who try to disparage all metaphysical depth, all existential and apocalyptic concerns, all mythology of evil and redemption, even the use of symbolic structures in the novel. They see all this as a morbid inheritance from Kierkegaard or an irrational malady of our period, or a defeatist religiosity. But such critics, nostalgic for the 18th Century or committed to a clean and bracing empiricism, are, in effect, ruling out the mythical dimension in human life and the imagination itself.

OUR present purpose, however, is to see what special side-lights and findings may emerge with respect to the more notable modern novelists in a theologically-oriented criticism. Here an excellent resource comes to hand in a new work, *The Prophetic Voice in Modern Fiction*, by William R. Mueller. The author has his doctorate in English but also a graduate theological degree from Union Theological Seminary. He deals with six outstanding modern novels, each one loaded with religious implications: James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* ("vocation"); Camus, *The Fall* ("fall"); Kafka, *The Trial* ("Judgment"); Faulkner, *The Sound and the Fury* ("suffering"); Graham Greene, *The Heart of the Matter* ("love"); Silone, *A Handful of Blackberries* ("the remnant"). What gives special relevance to the treatment is his felicitous idea of paralleling each novel with a related biblical theme and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exposition, and then noting the aspects of correspondence or disparity. Though the Scripture is viewed as authoritative there is fortunately no forcing of the literary texts. Thus the book well sets up the question whether the modern classics represent in some sense a threshold to religion—specifically to Judaism or Christianity—and if so, what all this may mean for our age. The conclusion is positive: the writers in question, as the title indicates, are seen as prophetic voices, standing at least in the anteroom of biblical faith, though they may or may not count themselves as of the visible church.

THE selection of novels illustrates one outstanding contribution of modern writing. The sphinx-like character of existence at its best and the immitigable limits on human striving are brought home to us in such a way that religious sentimentalities become irrelevant. Faith is forced back upon the testing point of a disabused honesty. The religious traditions must come alive at the limits where all our wisdom and resources fail: their conventional momentum is not enough. It is characteristic of these modern fables that our condition is not only realistically grasped as in the naturalistic novel but imaginatively. This is clear in works like the *Sound and the Fury* and *The Trial,* and one could add MacLeish's *J.B.,* Warren's *Brother to Dragons* and many others. So much on the side of religious illusions.

But equally on the side of religion's moral stance. Our modern classics by their desperate earnestness over unexamined social codes and social habits explode and riddle what are often "Christian" conformities, attitudes and stagnant or fossilized ceremonies. The "prophetic voice of modern fiction" at least says that there is no salvation in either the illusions or the codes, and thus agree with the biblical testimonies here marshalled which indict both salves and pacifiers on the one hand, and on the other compulsive legalities and pieties which are only the reverse side of cultural anemia.

Of the six novels chosen by Mueller two at least are "naturals" for the biblical themes juxtaposed. Camus' *The Fall* offers a modern instance that comes pat to set over against the ancient doctrine. Of course the "fall" in the novel, as is noted, is not one from innocence into sin, but from a state of sin unrecognized into one which is recognized. But the exposure of the modern sinful state and of virtue's manifold self-deceptions is powerful. And as Camus himself cites, "it is in fact a portrait, but not of an individual; it is the aggregate of the vices of our whole generation in their fullest expression."

Whether Camus' "hero" moves at the close toward redemption or not is unclear in the novel. Mueller is judicious in not imposing this happy ending upon the book. But Camus crowds the closing scenes with veiled auguries of baptismal regeneration, and thus in any case suggests that his lost soul moves close to deliverance. The situation is the same with the famous ambiguous close of Kafka's *Trial.* In both cases the O'Henry-like dilemma left to the reader powerfully suggests that the haunted and homeless multitudes of today grope in desperation for some new way of access to the great traditional faiths of the West in place of those familiar ways long impossible for many of them.

Our author is inclined to recognize the questionable stature of Graham Greene's *Heart of the Matter.* The Scobie who keeps falling into mortal sin precisely because of his compassion for the ugly and inconsolable is a very curious kind of saving victim. The case is similar with Faulkner's murderess-redemptrice in *Requiem for a Nun,* but that drama has compensating elements of an extraordinary kind. As Jarrett-Kerr has remarked, Greene is given to raising the hurdles factitiously high to show what grace can surmount. Mueller justifies Greene's book by consenting to read it as a *tour de force* and a morality play.

WE can also hold analogous reservations about the work in question of Camus. Americans' judgment is apt to go astray with French novels. A novel of ideas is only as good as the ideas in it, and for generations the French novel has had such a plethora of talents and such dazzling psychological and rhetorical standards that it is difficult in any decade to single out those few great masters who have something more. In Camus' *Fall* we have again dazzling talent but the fallen state depicted suffers from lacking the redeeming nuances and complexities that make sin really tragic. Moreover the use here by Mueller of Buber's "I-thou" and "I-it" scheme in connection with Camus' protagonist (as well as with the Chamberlaynes of the *Cocktail Party*) is not particularly illuminating. This dialectic, like that of *eros* and *agape* has been much overworked on all sides. Buber's truism, apart from his own rewarding development of it, has its popular success because it is only just not obvious. If it were obvious it would be flat. If it were more subtle it would escape the common reader. As it is, the latter, grasping the commonplace, feels highly flattered.

Joyce's *Portrait* offers an appropriate exhibit for the theme of vocation. Stephen Daedalus finds the meaning of his name and finds his vocation. It is outside the priesthood and even outside the church. How about Joyce himself? He certainly saw his hero as young and perhaps as somewhat flamboyant. Joyce himself may well have spoken, as Mueller suggests, through the words of Cranley:

> . . . you need not look upon yourself as driven away if you do not wish to go or as a heretic or an outlaw. There are many good believers who think as you do. Would that surprise you? The church is not the stone building nor even the clergy and their dogmas. It is the whole mass of those born into it.

Here then rises the question as to how the Christian is to assess Stephen and indirectly Joyce himself. Our author concludes:

> It would of course be foolish to argue that Stephen is a Christian, since he neither accepts his place gratefully as a member of Christ's Body nor points to Christ as the Way of salvation. Yet, would it not be short-sighted of the Christian to overlook the measure of Stephen's service? . . . Stephen, cut off from the Church Visible and the nation visible, yet serves Christian and Irishman alike as he stands in the anteroom to salvation, fashioning those words

"MOSCOW IS *a drab, ugly city—the only city I have ever seen which builds its slums new. Moscow's handful of skyscrapers—the product of Stalin's vainglory and his love of wedding-cake, neo-Roxy architecture—had, like Stalin's face, the pockmarks of time. The airport, which by rights should have had at least some of the superficial virtues of a Potemkin village, was a series of runways, one administration building, a single hangar able to service perhaps three planes, and an apron.*"

From the current issue of NATIONAL REVIEW. Write to Dept. N-5, 150 E. 35th St., N. Y. 16, N. Y., for a free copy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> which will call men to a knowledge of themselves and of their place in a mysterious and beautiful creation.

The same question as to who is in the anteroom and who is in the church occurs in other chapters. Rocco, the hero of Silone's *A Handful of Blackberries,* is put down as a true member of the biblical Remnant though he refuses membership in the church visible. Scobie is saved in the sense of Dogberry's cry: "O villain! Thou wilt be condemned into everlasting redemption for this." Of course Dilsey in *The Sound and the Fury* is a Christian, but also (on her say-so) Benjy is "de Lawd's chile."

IN THESE MATTERS of fencing off the sheep and the goats, of distinguishing prophet from heretic, or deciding who is far and who is not far from the kingdom of Heaven, the theologian is well advised to remit judgment to a higher instance. Mueller, we are happy to say, is averse to wielding the keys in any such fashion. The work of the artist cannot be dealt with in the same way as non-fictional propositions. Moreover, even here the old yard-sticks are not as definitive as they once were. If this volume had had a more comprehensive character the author would probably have wished to point out, with reference to his biblical sections, that a wholesale reconsideration is called for today, in the conditions of modern thought, of the meaning of the words, language, symbols of Scripture, creed and doctrine, and therefore of the meaning of "church" and "Christianity" and of the locus of the "Spirit." The measuring-sticks he takes in these sections from the Pentateuch, Paul, etc., are perforce textual and even in paraphrase archaic in expression. These norms therefore can appear rigid though they are not here rigidly applied. Take for example the following sentence in a summary of Paul's teaching about reconciliation: "God, by an act of love—the sacrifice of his Son to the blood of the cross—reconciled man to Himself, and the reconciliation freed man from his bondage to idolatry." Such phrases and texts will inevitably have a baffling ring to our contemporaries. Modern literature will better illuminate the truth in them if they themselves are more significantly stated.

As we have suggested the cumulative impression of such novels as these of Kafka, Faulkner and Camus is that there is today a frustrated craving for some viable version of our traditional faiths. The spiritual and intellectual history of the modern period has alienated many of the best elements of society from church and synagogue, and any reversal of this cumulative divorce is all but impossible. The religious institution and the tradition itself even at their best are fatefully identified with hereditary forms, pieties and responses which for all their preciousness do not speak to modern ears. Return to the church is today radically blocked for many. There are occasions when a youth or a man—like Robert Frost's Hired Man — may *have* to go home, and yet in the circumstances he cannot. We are not in this instance thinking of prodigal sons. The spiritually homeless alien of our world is in a parlous state like that of the arrested delivery of a child or any blocked organic process. This frustrated situation has all sorts of curious cultural and psychic consequences and they are disclosed in much current literature.

Such representative heroes as "K" or the Quentin of the *Sound and the Fury* or the Clamence of the *Fall* or Silone's Rocca, different as they are, all carry in their blood streams the archetypes of the classic Scriptures. In situations of extremity, or it may be in situations of fulfilment and ecstasy, these aliens may be reclaimed by the old pattern. But if these are not available to them in some viable contemporary form a kind of obsessive crisis is set up, such as is described in our novels.

The best illustration of this situation of "so near and yet so far" is that of Kafka's "K." Mueller well cites the extraordinary parable narrated to him by the priest in the Cathedral, that of the man from the country who through a long life and down to a despairing old age waits intimidated outside the open door of the Law only to learn at the point of death that it was not really closed to him. Famished for grace but cowed by the sinister hierarchies that appear to guard the mysteries he nevertheless later becomes aware of the "radiance that streams inextinguishably from the door of the Law." The close of the novel itself suggests similarly that "K" could have cleared himself of the oppressive charges and rejections that weighed upon him and saved himself the harrowing years of ever-renewed strategems and precautions by an original and authentic act of candor and simplicity. So Mueller sums it up:

> But the petitioners—K, Block, the man from the country, and the rest of them —are inattentive to the only source of saving grace. They dissipate their strength and time on unlicensed judges and helpless advocates and lack the wisdom and the faith which would surrender them to the inextinguishable radiance whose source lies beyond the door of the Law. K would seem to fear the message; we are told that "he wanted to put it [the parable] out of his mind."

We are not to think, however, that the hindrances for "K" were all of his own making. If any option of life is offered in *The Trial* it is of the most extreme ambiguity.

Joyce's young artist is estopped from espousal of the church as he knew it. We see him rebelling convulsively from what appears to him a formal ceremony but arrested by a vocation to a priesthood of the imagination which represents traditional apostleship only as it were, modulated into a new register. We note also how thin the veil is which separates Camus' Jean-Baptiste Clamence from a Christian resolution of his fallen state—so near and yet so far—as suggested by the symbols of his name, the doves, the water and the font.

WHAT is craved and groped for, we have said, is some meaningful version of the historic faiths. On the one hand this does indeed call for simplification and the shedding of historical detritus that stifles the tradition. But those liberals are in error who think that an old faith can be made "modern" merely by removing old foliage. Religions are more like evergreens than like deciduous trees. If the obligation of the agnostic today is like Stephen to continue forging on his own terms and without benefit of clergy the conscience of a new epoch, that of the church is to renew its own tradition. Of course religion like patriotism must be traditional, but an ever-renewed incandescence should continually transmit and transmute the primal life of the tradition and at the same time burn away irrelevant accumulations and out-dated automatisms. Thus the modern man and the ancient faith may once again draw near to each other like those that tunnel under the Alps from different sides.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Current National Myth

by Patrick O'Donovan

THIS single, huge and peculiar book has received more praise than the *opera omnia* of most authors receive in a lifetime. Colleagues of the writer have praised its timeliness and the revelatory accuracy of its dissection of the Senate process. Literary critics have respectfully blunted their pencils before its bulk and judged it by special criteria. Particularly in Washington, people buy

Advise and Consent
by Allen Drury
(Doubleday; $5.75)

it and even read it and discuss it with pleasure and approval and it is quite assured of success. Its golden progress through edition after edition, through *The Readers Digest,* through paperbacks, to the films is certain.

Its story concerns the Senate confirmation of a Secretary of State. It involves ruthless manipulation by a possibly great but certainly wicked President. It involves the ruin of a good Senator and the disgrace of a bad one. It involves the great but forgivable sin of a Majority Leader. And the eventual promise of the succession to the Presidency to the man who deserves it most. As counterpoint to the domestic brawling, there are renewed threats from Russia and more set backs for the Americans in the bitter race to conquer outer space.

In all this, detail is heaped on detail. A huge cast of politicians, each pinned down by an appropriate adjective, sprawls across the pages. Dialogue omits nothing. This is total recall at a typewriter. It is an attempt to present the truth by including everything. Hundreds of small conversations, dozens of biographies, innumerable incidents. There never has been such a source book in fiction. The style matches its bursting contents, rich, heavy and unselective.

But even the few who have no intention of reading the book must know the story by now. There are other aspects of it that have been lost in the respect that has greeted such industry. This is first of all a very right-wing book. The sin of the Leader of the Majority, which was to consent to blackmail of the foulest sort in order to get his measure through the Senate, is more readily forgivable than the would-be Secretary of State who is a "righteous Rollo" and had dealings with Them in the thirties. The inferior Senator who does the Leader's and President's dirty work is a crass and vulgar fellow and does not understand the unwritten rules of the Senate Club and he is properly punished. The President may be great, but he interferes with the legislative process. The obstuctive Southerner with his obsessive hatreds and prejudices, is, after all, a gentleman and a member of the Club's In-group. The British Ambassador is even more of a gentleman (and a peer as well) and he knows just how and when to rap out a swift and devasting rebuke to his Soviet colleague in a manner whose perfection has naturally required centuries of breeding and the habit of imperial command.

Behind and around these legitimate convictions, not often found in serious American journalism today, there is the Senate in action. In any parliamentary system that is worth its free postal arrangements the legislative body does develop a corporate personality of its own, bigger than the sum of the personalities involved and sometimes curiously at variance with the current set of members. In addition, the business of government is normally carried on and eased by innumerable private bargains and compromises which, if brought out into the clear sunlight and made to stand alone, would have a squalid and trivial air.

Yet in this senate of *Advise and consent,* the deals seem almost to comprise the whole. The electorate is there to be wooed as a means of returning to Washington, but it plays little part in the consideration of even the Good Senators. The offices are apportioned, the Presidency passed on as cynically as a crown in a turbulent medieval court. The Senators themselves behave like irresponsible Princes of the Blood. Some matter more, because of the size and importance of their fiefs; some are closer to the source of power; some are trusted or feared in accordance with their skill with poison or sword. Some are the political equivalent of royal bastards; their importance depends wholly on their status within the precincts of the palace. What they mean to the American electorate seems at best of tertiary moment.

But if this is not a textbook on the Senate, if it is a caricature, and a sensational and dangerously distorted one, the book is something else. It is vastly entertaining. The slow interplay of archetypes is restful. The impression that you are at a keyhole looking in on the source of power is fun. It is flattering to try to fix the characters in this *Roman à clef.* Good triumphs in the good tradition. The single tragedy—and here the book almost becomes a novel—of the blackmailed Senator is genuinely moving but not too moving, because the man after all really *was* a homosexual. It is read with pleasure, and there is no guilt in skipping. It is a ripping tale, and thundering good yarn. It is more than that. It is a genuinely and deservedly popular book. It asks no questions. It presents no problems. It comforts and cossets. One is compelled, while foreseeing the end, to find how it works out. It says what you long to hear. God's in his heaven and, despite Russian technological advances, all's right with the world. It is the sort of book that very few can produce. It is as rare as a work of art.

IT IS more than a best-seller. It joins the select company of good bad books. It is almost good enough to stand with Marie Corelli and Ouida and Hall Caine. It is the equivalent of those faintly daring books that thrilled Edwardian society and sold solidly and once provided their authors with small palaces in Venice and with Rolls Royces finished in yellow basket work. Despite the acclaim and the wealth they brought their authors, such books are forgotten today. Their pleasures were too precisely attuned to the moment, their "message" too exactly directed at what was fashionably but not seriously worried over. This is a portrait of an America that never really was and which, despite the fact that the book is set in the future, has never, thank God, the slightest chance of ever being. But if you wish to know what version of the national myth is now current, then, just as Ouida's exquisite guardsmen suggest what fantasies the English once nourished about their upper classes, so *Advise and Consent* may tell you what secret image of America you now delight in but would hesitate to express too openly.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Justices on Display

by Alexander M. Bickel, Jr.

HALF OF *The Public Papers of Chief Justice Earl Warren* and much the greater part of *Douglas of the Supreme Court* are selections of opinions. Offerings of this sort, a bit of a fashion in recent years, are extremely treacherous business at best. Of the many difficulties and dangers they are fraught with, hardly one occurs to me that is solved or avoided in either of these books.

As Mr. Vern Countryman, Dean of the Law School of the University of New Mexico, says in the preface to the volume he edited, his 69 selections are meant to be representative of the 600 or so opinions Justice Douglas has produced. Well, 69 out of 600 isn't representation, it's a poll; and whether or not voters or consumers can be sensibly polled, opinions of a Justice of the Supreme Court cannot be.

Douglas of the Supreme Court—
A Selection of his Opinions,
Edited and with a biographical sketch
by Vern Countryman
(Doubleday; $5.95)

•

The Public Papers of
Chief Justice Earl Warren
Edited by Henry M. Christman
(Simon and Schuster; $4.50)

"His work," Brandeis said of Holmes, "is a chemical composition and not a conglomerate." We must judge a judge first—before even we attempt an appreciation of his ultimates; for if he fails this first test, his ultimates are scarcely important—by the coherence of his work, by the degree of its resemblance to a chemical composition. We learn from these books something of the rhetoric but nothing reliable of the chemistry or near-chemistry of the Chief Justice or of Justice Douglas. No doubt the editors, who read everything, did. But they do not give us their documented judgment. They ask us to make our own, and we cannot.

This is the ineluctable difficulty, which can be met only by not publishing such selections, no matter how jaunty a title one (or one's publisher) has invented that simply begs to be used. But there are yet other difficulties. Many of the opinions in these volumes were delivered in cases in which the Court divided. Such cases, in the Anglo-American judicial tradition, are occasions for dialogues. Opinions delivered in them lose a great deal in themselves if presented alone, out of the context of other opinions that accompanied them. Passing that, unless the positions taken in the other opinions are scrupulously rendered in summary, the end result is a misrepresentation of the Court and its processes and of other Justices. Both these selections achieve that end result more than once.

A striking instance in Henry M. Christman's book (which, incidentally, contains just 11 of Chief Justice Warren's opinions) is the *Mesarosh* case. This was a federal Smith Act prosecution in which testimony was taken from one Joseph Mazzei, a sort of professional government witness. It later appeared that Mazzei had at other times testified not wisely but too well, and, if he had not necessarily perjured himself in other cases, if it could not be conclusively shown that he had told falsehoods, had certainly recited some whopping unlikelihoods. Obviously, his testimony now was therefore suspect. On the other hand, everyone tells the truth sometimes, just as almost everyone sometimes lies; and the first half of this statement holds even for liars who have been caught. Moreover, not all lies are material.

Be all that as it may, a majority of the Court in this case, Chief Justice Warren writing, held that the conviction had to fall and that there would have to be a new trial. Mazzei, the Chief Justice said, could not have told the truth in this case, his testimony sufficiently poisoned the entire proceeding, and: "The government of a strong and free nation does not need convictions based upon such testimony." Well and good. "Justice Harlan," Mr. Christman tells the reader, "joined by Justices Frankfurter and Burton, dissented, declaring that the case should be remanded to the trial court." Did these three Justices then believe (how unspeakable of them!) that the government of a strong and free nation *does* need convictions based upon such testimony? I am able to report, though with no help from Mr. Christman, that they did not; that, seeing in the case an issue of orderly judicial administration lightly skipped over by the Chief Justice, they thought that the trial judge was in a better position to make the initial determination which the majority undertook without even reading the record of the trial; and that for that reason and to that end they would have sent the case back to the trial judge.

Dean Countryman's italicized notes accompanying the opinions he has selected are a good deal more elaborate than Mr. Christman's; but on the point I am discussing they not infrequently come to the same thing. This happens, for example, with the *Terminiello* case of 1949, which was decided by Justice Douglas as a free speech case. Dean Countryman so treats it, and with some feeling, too. For the dissenters (Vinson, Frankfurter, Jackson and Burton), however, the decisive issue was a procedural one. Dean Countryman is content simply to record that they dissented. They are thus placed in an unendurably false position, especially since on the basis of what is printed of the Douglas opinion, they must have come out for sin pure and simple, out of sheer cussedness.

THIS brings me to a final bone I am going to pick with Dean Countryman. Mr. Christman omits footnotes and dissents, but otherwise he prints what he selects in full. Not so Dean Countryman, who cuts what he is pleased to call "technical discussion," and gives no indication of it aside from a general warning in the preface. The *Terminiello* opinion thus ends up as 2/3 of a page. What is more important, in *Bowles* v. *Willingham*, a wartime OPA case, in which Justice Douglas, resting on grounds that have since been widely criticized, held against a claim of individual procedural rights, that rather unpleasant part of the opinion is cheerfully omitted. I have not checked every other case against the official reports, and memory has surely been a poor reliance. I can only say that 69 out of 600 is inadequate enough; that elimination of the other parties to the dialogues is a serious drawback; and that conveniently tailored opinions really cap it all.

A word about that half of *The Public Papers of Chief Justice Earl Warren* which is more properly so called. One half of that half is taken up with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speeches of Governor Warren of California. Here is no Wilson and no Stevenson, but a decent and on the whole an encouraging figure of a public man, just the same. I could wish that the Governor had been a little slower to enlist Lincoln in Modern Republican ranks in Boston on February 12, 1952; but then that is a day on which worse has been done to Lincoln. I could wish also that there were less of a tendency for the well-meaning but ill-fitting cliché to trip easily off the tongue, fathered by the preceding one, as when the Chief Justice referred to Brandeis at Waltham, Mass., on November 11, 1956, as a "great, simple, kindly, prophetic American," and remarked that he "fortified his faith and practice in the religion of his fathers." Few who knew him thought of Brandeis as simple. If he was kindly, it was not when he was great and prophetic. And he was not religious. However, I should not fail to mention the Chief Justice's paper entitled "The Law and the Future," which originally appeared in *Fortune* for November, 1955, and is well worth reading.

MOVIES

The Devil and De Sica

The Devil's Disciple
(United Artists)
The Tailor's Maid
(Trans-Lux)

IF there was any doubt left that Bernard Shaw is immortal, the film producers are erasing it. One of the proofs of durability in dramatic literature is that the work both invites and survives mistreatment. As soon as the author dies or as soon as legal protection expires for his work, the whittlers swoop down, ready to modernize or "interpret" or make musicals of it—anything to reduce it to their size. For the whittlers—whether they be star actors, egotistical directors, or film producers—have an ambivalent relationship with a great man's work: they recognize his greatness and at the same time are unbearably teased by his being too large for their embrace.

Therefore the lover of Shaw (like this writer) can keep a happy heart about the films of *Androcles, The Doctor's Dilemma,* and the new *Devil's Disciple.* This last and latest is a vulgar, inept, badly acted, cretinously directed, boring film, but never mind. The play will survive it, to be mistreated again.

Not that this eighth play of Shaw's (1896) is one of his best; indeed, it is a small shock to remember that it was written after *Candida* and *You Never Can Tell.* But it does have point and structure and a firm grasp of melodrama seasoned with high comedy. The filmmakers would doubtless justify their ravaging of the play by explaining that it had to be tempered to the film form, freed of its theatrical straitjacket.

This, presumably, explains why introductory and transitional scenes are done with jerky figurines as in a cute documentary for children: why the offstage battles in the play become the major matters in the picture: why the leading characters are so eviscerated that the theme of the play is incomprehensible to anyone who has not read it: why the producers have assisted Shaw with the dialogue of John Dighton and Roland Kibbee so that the result sounds as if the original play and some old costume-drama movie scripts had been thrown into a Waring blender.

Also, they had Laurence Olivier playing Burgoyne, and they could not let him make as late an entrance as he does in the play. Dighton and Kibbee could not quite supply more dialogue for him, so they simply broke up his big scene and scattered it throughout the film from the beginning: thus crippling the scene when it finally comes and completely negating the effect of Burgoyne's delayed appearance.

In the title role, the diabolist protestant, the muscular mirror-image of the cynical intellectual Burgoyne, Kirk Douglas gives us a hustling thug right out of one of Jimmy Hoffa's locals. As Anderson, the preacher who (like Shaw's Ferrovius) finds his faith in fighting, Burt Lancaster is so incompetent as to be pitied, not criticized; he is comfortable only in the battle scenes in which he wanders appropriately dazed. Most of Eva LeGallienne's performance as Mrs. Dudgeon lies, one supposes, on the cut-

Coming . . .

SEPTEMBER 28

A NEW DESIGN

A NEW LOOK IN

The New Republic

★

Starting September 28, William Costello's new "unauthorized" study of

Richard Nixon

. . . a book-length series

★

Half-price offer! 16 issues of the new NR for only $2! Order today for your friends . . . save $2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ting-room floor. Janette Scott, as Judith, gives an exhibition which will help me to avoid her future films.

Laurence Olivier lends his presence, but little more, to the proceedings. It would take a very inferior actor to Sir Laurence to fail as Burgoyne. It is that juicy kind of part which, despite the facts, makes the audience associate the wit with the actor instead of the author. Sir Laurence, who walks through the film seemingly bearing a sign saying "Don't Blame Any of This on *Me*", nevertheless cannot avoid scoring Shaw's points.

That good actor Harry Andrews is Major Swindon. He played Creon to Olivier's Oedipus with the Old Vic in 1946, and seeing them together again in this tiresome butchery, I thought of Isherwood's line in *Prater Violet* about the two film-makers who know they are currently engaged on trash but are like two married men who meet in a brothel without shame.

FROM Italy comes a pleasant film called *The Tailor's Maid*, with Vittorio de Sica, Marcello Mastroianni, and lovely Marisa Merlini. Like many Italian films, especially comedies, it is the work of a number of writers who may never have met each other but all of whom contributed plot strands and scenes. The result is a script of unrelated elements, most of them unresolved, but scene by scene the picture is entertaining.

It is a series of comic variations on the theme of troubled relations between parents and children. De Sica plays a fashionable Roman tailor, father of a nubile daughter, and Ruggero Marchi plays a doctor, father of a boy in love with her. The handsome and talented de Sica gives us another enjoyable performance in which he makes game of his own good looks and sexuality.

The film is not in the same class as the earlier de Sica-Mastroianni gem *Too Bad She's Bad*; but it almost makes up in profusion of ideas and skill of execution for a basic lack of coherence.

STANLEY KAUFFMANN

Notes on Contributors

AMOS WILDER is the author of *Theology and Modern Literature*. PATRICK O'DONOVAN is Washington correspondent of *The Observer* (London). FRANK J. WARNKE is an American critic at present travelling in Europe.

MUSIC

The Dilemma & the Promise of Modern Opera

AMONG the first things the American opera-goer in Europe is likely to notice are the vast repertoire of the average European house and the important position of modern opera within that repertoire. In the years since World War II some modern composers whose work is practically unknown in America have achieved a position beside the acknowledged classic masters and have thereby given to European opera a vitality and variety sadly lacking in our own country. Leos Janacek, who was born in 1854 but who composed all his operas between 1903 and his death in 1928, is perhaps the most recent 20th-Century master to conquer a place in the European opera world, and as yet his triumph embraces only a few countries —his native Czechoslovakia, Germany, Holland, and, to some extent, England.

Holland has long been one of the important centers for the Janacek fashion, and the annual Holland festival has given a hearing to several of his less well-known works — this year *Katya Kabanova*. The Holland *Katya* had guests from the National Opera of Prague in almost all the important roles as well as a Czech conductor and a Czech stage designer; their conception of Janacek's work can probably be considered definitive and its strengths and weaknesses those of Janacek himself.

Katya has, to begin with, a weak and dated book: Ostrovski's glum Russian melodrama *The Storm*, which tells, without nuance or much psychological penetration, the story of a sensitive woman in a small town on the Volga who is plagued by a weak husband and a tyrannical mother-in-law. More in despair than in passion she takes a lover, but a conscience exacerbated by the tradition-laden atmosphere of her environment drives her to confess her adultery in public and then to drown herself in the Volga. An air of 1880's naturalism lies heavy over the whole piece and at times almost obscures a musical conception which is neither superficial, dated, nor naturalistic. For the score of *Katya Kabanova* is a major achievement in modern music drama.

Melodic ideas rather than melodies as such make up the texture of *Katya Kabanova*; Janacek's inspiration seems to start always from tight, pithy phrases which one half expects to be developed into symmetrical melodic arcs but which Janacek chooses to drop almost immediately. Just when one thinks he has dropped an idea permanently, it recurs in a different form, a different context, with effects which range from subtle irony to overpowering dramatic contrast. The basic point about musical elaboration in Janacek is that it is thematic rather than melodic, and in this respect he shows a stronger connection to the great German composers than to the Slavic forbears—Moussorgsky, Dvorak, Smetana—with whom he is most often compared. Ultimately his work is best understood as a continuation of the great musical tradition of Central Europe, a tradition which, although basically German, has both nourished itself on and given sustenance to the musical life of Czech, Magyar, and Croat.

JANACEK'S SCORE to *Katya Kabanova* comes close to giving life and deep significance is a rather pointless drama. One seems, in hearing it, to be hovering on the verge of some great revelation, and the music strives always toward universal rather than particularized meanings. The powerful motif associated in the early scenes with the Kabanov family rapidly assumes new associations—with the Volga, with the force of convention, ultimately with human destiny—and it almost succeeds in broadening the work's frame of reference to that of the highest art. That it does not completely succeed in doing so may be attributed to the dramatic material itself—material which might serve well enough for drama *with* music but which does not lend itself entirely to Janacek's goal, drama *in* music.

I hope my distinction does not seem frivolous; it is, I think, an important one. The dead average of the 19th-Century opera—the kind of thing which we find done to perfection in *Trovatore* or *Gioconda* or *Freischütz*—aims at drama *with* music, a heavily emotional, action-filled piece of theatre which stops itself from time to time to comment on its own significance in glorious aria and ensemble. More important works of that century—

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Traviata, Carmen, Ballo in Maschera, and the like—aim at a more organic union of music and drama; and the towering achievements — *Tristan and Isolde, Die Meistersinger, Don Carlo, Falstaff*— reach it, become, fully, drama *in* music. In their own terms, 19th-Century terms, they arrive at something like the magical union which seems, in Mozart, so celestically easy. The opera of our own century has been desperately involved in the same problem and has shown, in its varied attempts to solve it, a remarkable purity of intention.

ONE KIND of reconciliation of the dramatic necessity and the musical necessity in modern opera might be called the drama *for* music. Its chief exemplar is Berg's *Wozzeck,* in which a prose drama of compelling power is presented with absolute fidelity through a score which "accompanies." But in this work Berg is not content to let the music take second place; the entire score to *Wozzeck*, even as it articulates the stage action, falls into the rigid formal categories of pure music. The effect is thus a double one; music and drama interact, but each remains master in its own sphere. A similar effect emerges from Britten's recent *Turn of the Screw*, in which the music and the drama have a similar relationship.

But drama *for* music is not drama *in* music. Berg and Britten have achieved fine things, but other modern composers, among them Janacek, have come closer to the organic unity toward which opera, for all its hybrid peculiarity, strives. Modern attempts at drama *in* music fall into two categories: "number" opera and "through-composed" opera. "Number" opera preserves the ancient distinction between recitative on the one hand and aria and ensemble on the other; sometimes it derives from Mozart; more often it attempts to follow the model of the 19th-Century Italians. Sometimes, as in Stravinsky's *Rake's Progress,* it achieves a moving union of tradition and modernity; sometimes, as in Samuel Barber's *Vanessa*, it is a still-birth which lends credence to the all-too-familiar strictures against opera as an art form.

But by far the greater number of successful 20th-Century dramas in music are through-composed; whether or not they show any musical kinship to the works of Wagner, they share with those works a common conception of the nature of music drama, a conception which has no place for the distinction between number and recitative. The exponents of this kind of opera include both Janacek and the composer who is probably the major figure in the opera of the first half of our century, Richard Strauss.

One of the most important aspects of Strauss' modernity as a music dramatist is his treatment of highly intellectual themes and subjects. *Die Frau ohne Schatten* (finally to be heard next season by an American audience, thanks to the courage and enterprise of the San Francisco Opera) successfully brings musical life to a symbolist libretto which is both profound and difficult; *Arabella* (which, after two tries, may yet become domesticated at the Met) revives once again the sophisticated and all-embracing irony which had distinguished *Der Rosenkavalier*. In both operas the score picks up the verbal hints of the text and develops them in musical terms: the massive thematic interrelationships of *Die Frau* have a good deal to say about that opera's subject—immortality as a product of the ideal relationship between male and female, body and spirit—and the process of melodic reminiscence in *Arabella* eloquently embodies that opera's complicated concern with duration and mutability.

I have referred to the "dilemma" of modern opera. In truth, of course, that dilemma is no different from the one faced by Gluck and Mozart, by Wagner and Verdi, and solved by them in such radically different but equally satisfying ways. It is wonderfully appropriate that the most sublime of modern music dramas, Richard Strauss' *Capriccio,* should deal with just this problem. Composed by some miracle of art in 1943, in the middle of Hitler's disintegrating Germany, it is the work of a man whose eyes are turned inward, away from the holocaust and toward the unchanging world of art. It is set in France "shortly after the operatic reforms of Gluck," and its major characters are a poet, a composer, and the countess whom they both love and who must choose between them. In music of singular purity and in Clemens Krauss' brilliant dialogue they debate the problem of opera, with frequent contributions by an impressario and an actress. The lady, of course, does not make her decision between words and music, and the curtain falls on an eternally unanswered question. "Is there an answer which is not banal?" sings the Countess in her great closing monologue. The history of opera in the 20th Century would suggest that, as usual, there is no answer, but that the provisional answers framed by genius are never banal. The average opera-goer at the Met may not yet know it, but in the first half of our century we have lived through one of the great ages of opera, a great age which is perhaps not yet over.

FRANK J. WARNKE

EUROPE

We'll see the usual, plus Dublin past the Iron Curtain—Africa to Sweden. A different trip—for the young in spirit who want to be accompanied but not herded around. Also shorter trips. $724-$1390.
EUROPE SUMMER TOURS
255 Sequoia, Box NR Pasadena, California

EXPERIMENT WITH "SLEEP-LEARNING!"
Self-hypnosis. Use your phonograph, recorder. Fascinating, educational. Details free.
Sleep-Learning Research Association
Box 24-NP Olympia, Washington

JOBS ABROAD FOR TEACHERS, writers, librarians, translators, stenographers, and administrators. Top salaries paid by American and foreign companies, governmental and international organizations. How, when and where to apply, $1.00. Included free "Student Opportunities Abroad." Dorf, 186-NR, Covington Lane, Woodbury, N. J.

MOVING?
INVESTIGATE THIS NEW WAY OF LIFE FOR LIBERALS
Raise your children in the free, healthy atmosphere of an intelligently integrated development. Modern 6-8 room homes, superior construction and planning from $13,000 to $29,000. Buy, rent. Philadelphia, Princeton, New York, Connecticut areas. Represented by Concord Associates, Modern Community Developers subsidiary. Contact Stuart E. Wallace, (Dept. N) 84 Nassau St., Princeton, New Jersey, WAlnut 4-0707. In Philadelphia area, MErcury 9-4576.

WELL INFORMED?
Today's major current controversy is the labor question: racketeering, arbitration of strikes, etc. The California Debate Research Bureau has prepared **"THE LABOR QUESTION,"** a complete guide to labor issues. Primarily for debaters, but of interest to every thinking individual. $1.25 postpaid. Write: **California Debate Research Bureau,** 176 South Fuller Avenue, Los Angeles 36 California. Department 10.

FACTS, INFORMATION obtained, researched on any topic or subject by expert. $2.00 per inquiry. Free booklet included.
John Wiley
230 Rochester Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.C.

NEW OPPORTUNITY—GIVES EXTRA MONEY for you or your organization. Show **MASTERPIECES BY EVANS,** fabulously-beautiful Christmas cards. Wonderful assortment for persons, business houses. Send for **FREE** luxurious album of 86 magnificent 1959 selections. Also, **FREE** "Complete Guide For Fund-Raising For Your Club." Write: **New England Art Publishers, North Abington 869, Mass.**

WE MOVE YOU WITHOUT TEARS
Economical, insured household moving. Vans, station wagons. Any time, any place. **The Padded Wagon, AL 5-8343 (NYC)**

BRITISH SHOES FOR GENTLEMEN at a fraction of their American retail price! $10.95 includes duty and import charges. Delivery in ten days from receipt of order. Unconditional money back guarantee. Write for free illustrated catalogue. Steven Williams, Jr., Ltd., 40 Chatham Road, Short Hills, New Jersey.

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 901 N ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

(Continued from page 3)

is not making the same kind of film now that he did in 1935 (*The Thirty-nine Steps*) or in 1938 (*The Lady Vanishes*). I am an admirer of these early Hitchcock films, as I judge Mr. Kauffmann is. But I think Mr. Kauffmann is making a serious error of judgment regarding Hitchcock's latest films. It does seem that Mr. Kauffmann is going into the theatre with a fixed expectation, based on two or three early Hitchcock films; when he doesn't see what he expects to see, he becomes upset. A picture like *Vertigo* must be responded to in its own terms; it does not have the same "reality" which Mr. Kauffmann admires in early Hitchcock, but has instead a fantastic and dream-like quality . . . which is really very impressive. In this respect, the character of several of *Vertigo*'s climactic sections is similar in unreality and psychic shock to that of, for example, the dream scene at the beginning of Ingmar Bergman's *Wild Strawberries*. . . .

In *The Nation*, January 22, 1944 (as republished in *Agee On Film*), James Agee opened his review of Hitchcock's *Lifeboat*—a picture which he felt was disappointing—with these statements: "Crocodile tears over the alleged decline of Alfred Hitchcock have for years been a favorite cocktail among those who take moving pictures seriously. That has always seemed to me an impatient and cheap attitude to take toward any kind of change, or disturbance, in the work of a good artist." Mr. Kauffmann must realize that there are a great many people who still are convinced that Mr. Hitchcock is a top-flight director. If he wishes to convince them otherwise, he must write something better than a three-paragraph brush-aside, filled with unsupported value judgments . . . which never attempts to make clear what, in his opinion, is wrong.

B. PRESTON CLARK

Framingham Center, Mass.

. . . Mr. Kauffmann replies

MR. CLARK is clearly a more congenial soul than I. I could no more be persuaded to think of *Wild Strawberries* by anything in *Vertigo* than I could (as he suggests) forget the standards set by the early Hitchcock while watching *North by Northwest*. *Vertigo* was indeed an attempt to do something different, which does not necessarily make it a successful attempt. *Northwest* is surely, element by element, an attempt at a "real" suspense picture like his early ones; but, to leave technical matters out of it, would the 1935 Hitchcock have tolerated the high seaside cliffs on Long Island? Or a heroine in cahoots with the villain who turns out, not quite surprisingly, to be working for the FBI?

Let us indeed quote Agee. Not only did he find *Lifeboat* disappointing, but earlier, in 1943, he contradicted Mr. Clark's quotation by writing of *Shadow Of A Doubt*: "It is distinctly below the standards set by Hitchcock's best English work." *Spellbound* (1945) he called "surprisingly disappointing." Of another man's picture in 1947 he wrote: "A good deal has been derived from Hitchcock, but little of the intensity and conviction which made his *English* film so good." (Italics mine.) Of the last Hitchcock film he reviewed, *The Paradine Case* (1948): "The picture never for an instant comes to life."

I don't understand the phrase "value judgments" as a term of reproach. Are cool objective standards possible, or desirable, in art? Like Bernard Shaw, I have no use for unprejudiced critics. However, as Mr. Clark may have noted, I generally try to support my opinions with explications as space permits.

STANLEY KAUFFMANN

New York, N. Y.

► *How Many More States?*

SIRS:

WHAT AILS TRB on the territorial question? He opposed Alaska and Hawaiian statehood, and now after his return from Puerto Rico he speaks of "disaster" and "stray bits of real estate."

Is he serious about his fears that noncontiguity presents a real obstacle to incorporation into the Union? Surely his flight of a few hours to San Juan demolished that argument. Hawaii and Alaska as incorporated territories had nowhere to go but forward to statehood. Constitutionally, Puerto Rico is *apparently* in a different position: it is an organized, but non-incorporated possession of the United States, enjoying (since 1952) a large measure of autonomy. All but a handful of recalcitrant Puerto Ricans accepted the Congressional grant of US citizenship in 1917. TRB does not mention the Jones Act, or seem to realize its implications. The man talking fluent Spanish on the radio is an American citizen. Governor Muñoz to the contrary, the present home rule government is a transition stage on the road to assumption for the first time of sovereignty by Puerto Rico. This can come about in two ways, and two ways only: first, through independence, which is highly unlikely; or through the admission of Puerto Rico as the fifty-first state, the "inevitable historical consequence" of an American territorial policy begun in 1787.

By every test, except the all-important ability to pay for it, Puerto Rico merits acceptance as a state. The ability to support federal taxation should be the only real obstacle. When the Island is ready and states its preference for statehood, continental Americans should welcome their fellow citizens into the Union.

FRANK OTTO GATELL

Washington, D. C.

The New Republic *welcomes communications from its readers in regard to subjects of current interest. Those of 300 words or less lend themselves to publication more readily than longer letters.*

G. P. Putnam's Sons
Publishers since 1838
announce
The Putnam $10,000 Awards
for original works of fiction and non-fiction
Write for details to
THE PUTNAM AWARDS
Dept. I
G. P. Putnam's Sons
210 Madison Avenue, N. Y. 16, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED